

2000 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

94th Annual Convention

January 8-11, 2000

San Diego, California

PROCEEDINGS

7
9
11
11
11
13
15
32
35
35
35
56
57
61
62
65
68
69
70
72
75
77
77
79
09
126
127
127
127
145
163
163
164
165
167
169
172
175
175
176



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

P O Box 6222
 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6222
 317/917-6222
 ncaa.org
 August 2000

Edited By: Michael V Earle, *Publishing Manager*

Distributed to chief executive officers, conference commissioners, affiliated and corresponding members.

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association

Table of Contents

I. REGISTER 2000

Governance Structure	7
Convention Delegates and Visitors	19

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE 94TH NCAA CONVENTION

Opening Business Session	41
Opening Remarks	41
Report of the Executive Committee	41
Report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee	43
State of the Association Address	45
Association-wide Legislation	52
NCAA Honors Dinner	55
Welcome	55
Invocation	55
Introduction of Master of Ceremonies	56
Today's Top VIII Awards	57
Response — Top VIII Awards	61
Silver Anniversary Awards	62
Response — Silver Anniversary Awards	65
NCAA Award of Valor	68
Response — Award of Valor	69
Theodore Roosevelt Award	70
Response — Theodore Roosevelt Award	72
Benediction	75
Division I Forum	77
Welcome	77
Basketball Working Group Proposals	79
Amateurism	109
Closing Remarks	126
Division II Forum	127
Opening Remarks	127
Health and Safety Issues	127
Amateurism Deregulation	145
Division II Business Session	163
Opening Remarks	163
Presidents Council Report	164
Strategic Plan Report	165
Management Council Report	167
Deregulation Report	169
Budget and Finance Committee Report	172
Proposed Amendments	175
Consent Package	175
Amendment Process — Emergency Legislation (No. 13) ..	176

Eligibility — Additional Season of Competition Waiver (No. 14)	177
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Requirements (No. 15)	178
Initial Eligibility — Core-Curriculum Requirements — Nontraditional Courses (No. 16)	179
Satisfactory Progress — International Baccalaureate Program Examinations (No. 17)	180
Financial Aid — Board Allowance (No. 18)	181
Housing and Meals — Vacation-Period Expenses (No. 19)	181
Women's Championships — Sponsorship Criteria — Minimum Period (No. 20)	182
National Collegiate Championship — Women's Ice Hockey (No. 21)	184
National Collegiate Championship — Women's Water Polo (No. 22)	184
Geographical Scheduling Waiver — Football (No. 23)	185
Use of Institutional Name or Logo (No. 24)	186
Personnel — Athletically Related Income (No. 25)	186
Outside-Income Restrictions (No. 26)	187
Employment With Professional Sports Organizations — Nonpermissible Arrangements (No. 27)	188
Permissible Employment or Income Arrangements — Professional Sports Organization (No. 28)	189
Recruiting — Telephone Calls by Representatives of Athletics Interests (No. 29)	189
Recruiting — Contact and Telephone Calls (No. 30)	190
Recruiting — Evaluations (No. 31)	191
Recruiting Materials (No. 32)	193
Recruiting — Complimentary Admissions (Official Visits) (No. 33)	194
Recruiting — Division II Tryout (No. 34)	194
Championships Committee Report	195
Morning Session Closing Remarks	199
Afternoon Session	199
Window of Reconsideration	199
Proposed Amendments	199
Recruiting — Telephone Calls (No. 35)	199
Offers and Inducements — Employment of Two-Year Prospects (No. 36)	200
Recruiting — Video Materials (No. 37)	201
Advertisements and Promotions — Championships Posters (No. 38)	201
Official Visit — Complimentary Admissions (No. 39)	201
Nonscholastic-Based Basketball (No. 40)	202
Season of Competition Waiver — 60-Day Deadline (No. 41)	203

Contest Exemption — Division II Football — Mineral Water Bowl (No. 42)	203
Maximum Dates of Competition — Division II Women's Lacrosse (No. 43)	205
Preseason Practice Start Date — Division II Tennis (No. 44)	206
First Date of Competition — Division II Tennis (No. 45) ..	206
Division II Membership — Transfer of Provisional Membership (No. 46)	206
Change of Division Membership — Notification and Championships Eligibility (No. 47)	207
Change of Division Membership — Committee Service (No. 48)	208
Closing Remarks	208
Division III Forum	211
Opening Remarks	211
Developing Positive Student-Athlete Behavior	212
Closing Remarks	235
Division III Business Session	237
Opening Remarks	237
Presidents Council Report	241
Management Council Report	243
Proposed Amendments	248
Conditions and Obligations of Conference Membership — Chief Executive Officer Authority (No. 49)	249
Conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committees (No. 50)	249
All-Star Contests (No. 51)	250
Season of Competition — Minimum Amount of Competition (No. 52)	251
Two-Year College Transfers — Two-Year Nonparticipation Exception (No. 53)	253
Playing and Practice Seasons — Competition in Nontraditional Segment (No. 55)	253
Women's Championships — Sponsorship Criteria — Minimum Period (No. 56)	267
National Collegiate Championship — Women's Ice Hockey (No. 57)	267
National Collegiate Championship — Women's Water Polo (No. 58)	269
Closing Remarks	270
Strategic Plan Discussion	270
Student-Athlete Advisory Committee Report	272
Institutional Self-Study Guide Discussion	274
Financial Aid Discussion	279
Closing Remarks	284
Afternoon Session	285
Opening Remarks	285

Window of Reconsideration	285
Playing and Practice Seasons — Competition in Nontraditional Segment (No. 55)	285
Gender and Ethnic Diversity Discussion	296
Deregulation Discussion	309
Amateurism Task Force Discussion	314
Tuesday Morning Session	324
Opening Remarks	324
Proposed Amendments	325
Deregulation Package	325
Permissible Expenses — Meals (No. 80)	325
Housing and Meals — Vacation-Period Expenses (No. 81)	326
Practice Expenses — Women's Rowing — Weather Exception (No. 82)	326
Permissible Benefits — Reasonable Refreshments (No. 83)	327
Annual Exemptions — Alumni Contests — Division III Basketball (No. 84)	327
Annual Exemptions — Alumni Meet — Indoor and Outdoor Track and Field (No. 85)	329
Playing and Practice Seasons — Contest Exemptions (No. 86)	330
International Competition — Summers (No. 87)	330
Membership Requirements — Minimum Participants — Division III Women's Fencing (No. 88)	331
NCAA Championships — Bench Personnel — Logo Restrictions (No. 89)	332
Consent Package	333
De Minimis Violation — Requirement for Practice (No. 91)	333
Closing Remarks	334
Election of Management Council Members	335
Athletics Performance Enhancement Discussion	336
NCAA Public Relations Study and Plan Discussion	350
Closing Remarks	360
Window of Reconsideration	361
Closing Remarks	361

III. APPENDICES

A. Legislative Proposals	A-1
B. Roll-Call Votes	A-107
C. Past Convention Sites	A-108
D. NCAA Officers, 1906-1999	A-111

NCAA Governance Structure

Executive Committee

(20 members)

Chair—Charles Wethington Jr.

DIVISION I

Name	Institution	Term Expires
Carol A. Cartwright	Kent State University	Jan. 2004*
John T. Casteen III	University of Virginia	Jan. 2002*
Leory Davis	South Carolina State University	Jan. 2002*
Milton A. Gordon	California State University, Fullerton	Jan. 2003*
Robert Lawless	University of Tulsa	Jan. 2002*
V. Lane Rawlins	University of Memphis	Jan. 2002*
Harold T. Shapiro	Princeton University	Jan. 2003*
Kenneth A. Shaw	Syracuse University	Jan. 2003*
Graham B. Spanier	Pennsylvania State University	Jan. 2001*
Rev. David T. Tyson	University of Portland	Jan. 2001*
Claire Van Ummersen	Cleveland State University	Jan. 2003*
Charles Wethington Jr.	University of Kentucky	Jan. 2001*

DIVISION II

Arend D. Lubbers	Grand Valley State University	Jan. 2003*
Gladys Styles Johnston	University of Nebraska at Kearney	Jan. 2002*

DIVISION III

Thomas B. Courtice	Ohio Wesleyan University	Jan. 2002*
Ann H. Die	Hendrix College	Jan. 2001*

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL CHAIRS

(Ex officio, nonvoting members)

Division I: Edward "Ted" Leland, Stanford University, Jan. 2002*

Division II: Clint Bryant, Augusta State University, Jan. 2003*

Division III: Walter J. Johnson, North Central College, Jan. 2001*

President: Cedric W. Dempsey

Note: The NCAA president votes only in the case of tie votes among the other voting members.

NCAA staff liaisons:

James L. Isch

Bridget Belgiovine

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection) to the Executive Committee

Division I Board of Directors

(18 members)

Chair—Graham B. Spanier

DIVISION I-A

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Atlantic Coast	John T. Casteen III, University of Virginia	Jan. 2002*
Big East	Kenneth A. Shaw, Syracuse University	Jan. 2003*
Big Ten	Graham B. Spanier, Pennsylvania State University	Jan. 2001*
Big 12	Robert Hemenway, University of Kansas	Jan. 2001
Big West	Milton A. Gordon, California State University, Fullerton	Jan. 2003*
Conference USA	V. Lane Rawlins, University of Memphis	Jan. 2002*
Mid-American	Carol A. Cartwright, Kent State University	Jan. 2004*
Mountain West	Carol Harter, University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Jan. 2004*
Pacific-10	David B. Frohnmaier, University of Oregon	Jan. 2003*
Southeastern	Charles Wethington Jr., University of Kentucky	Jan. 2001*
Western Athletic	Robert Lawless, University of Tulsa	Jan. 2002*

DIVISION I-AA AND I-AAA

Colonial Athletic	Linwood H. Rose, James Madison University	Jan. 2004*
Ivy Group	Harold T. Shapiro, Princeton University	Jan. 2003*
Midwestern	Claire Van Ummersen, Cleveland State University	Jan. 2003*
Mid-Continent	Donald Spencer, Western Illinois University	Jan. 2001*
Mid-Eastern	Leroy Davis, South Carolina State University	Jan. 2002*
Ohio Valley	Ron Eaglin, Morehead State University	Jan. 2004*
West Coast	Rev. David T. Tyson, University of Portland	Jan. 2001*

NCAA staff liaisons:

S. David Berst

Robin J. Green

Division I Management Council

(49 members)

Chair—Edward "Ted" Leland

DIVISION I-A

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Atlantic Coast	Arthur W. Cooper, North Carolina State University	Jan. 2003*
Atlantic Coast	Deborah A. Yow, University of Maryland, College Park	Jan. 2001*

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection)

Conference

<i>Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Atlantic Coast	Ron Wellman, Wake Forest University	Jan. 2002
Big East	Patricia Thomas, Georgetown University	Jan. 2003*
Big East	Gene DeFilippo, Boston College	Jan. 2001*
Big East	Stan Wilcox, Big East Conference	Jan. 2004*
Big Ten	Percy Bates, University of Michigan	Jan. 2003*
Big Ten	Ellen Perry, Pennsylvania State University	Jan. 2001*
Big Ten	Clarence Doninger, Indiana University	Jan. 2004*
Big 12	Gerald Lage, Oklahoma State University	Jan. 2003*
Big 12	Eugene D. Smith, Iowa State University	Jan. 2001*
Big 12	Chris Plonsky, University of Texas at Austin	Jan. 2002
Big West	Angela D. Taylor, University of Nevada	Jan. 2003*
Conference USA	Michael L. Slive, Conference USA	Jan. 2002*
Conference USA	Kathryn Statz, Marquette University	Jan. 2004*
Conference USA	Tom Jurich, University of Louisville	Jan. 2003*
MAC	Andrea Seger, Ball State University	Jan. 2001*
Mountain West	Chris Hill, University of Utah	Jan. 2004*
Pacific-10	Edward "Ted" Leland, Stanford University	Jan. 2002*
Pacific-10	Betsy G. Stephenson, University of California, Los Angeles	Jan. 2004*
Pacific-10	Robert Aronson, University of Washington	Jan. 2001
Southeastern	Kathy DeBoer, University of Kentucky	Jan. 2004*
Southeastern	Jeremy N. Foley, University of Florida	Jan. 2002*
Southeastern	Damon Evans, University of Georgia	Jan. 2003*
Western Athletic	Karl D. Benson, Western Athletic Conference	Jan. 2002*

DIVISION I-AA

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Atlantic 10	Linda Bruno, Atlantic 10 Conference	Jan. 2001*
Big Sky	Kelly Woodward, Northern Arizona University	Jan. 2002*
Ivy Group	Jeffrey H. Orleans, Ivy Group	Jan. 2004*
Metro Atlantic	Richard J. Ensor, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	Jan. 2003*
Metro Atlantic	Alison Sexton, Fairfield University	Jan. 2002#
Mid-Eastern	Charles Harris, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	Jan. 2004*
Northeast	Marilyn A. McNeil, Monmouth University	Jan. 2002*
Ohio Valley	To be appointed	
Patriot	Carolyn Schlie Femovich, Patriot League	Jan. 2004*
Patriot	Richard M. Regan, College of the Holy Cross	Jan. 2004#
Southern	Alan Hauser, Appalachian State University	Jan. 2001*
Southland	Gregory Sankey, Southland Conference	Jan. 2001*
Southwestern	Rudy Washington, Southwestern Athletic Conference	Jan. 2003*

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection)

#Not eligible for reselection by virtue of conference no longer having seat

DIVISION I-AAA

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
America East	Edgar N. Johnson, University of Delaware	Jan. 2002 [*]
America East	Chris Monasch, America East	Jan. 2002 [#]
Big South	Thomas N. Hickman, Winthrop University	Jan. 2002 [*]
Colonial Athletic	Thomas O'Conner, George Mason University	Jan. 2004 [*]
Mid-Continent	Kathryn Berg, Southern Utah University	Jan. 2004 [*]
Midwestern	John C. Parry, Butler University	Jan. 2004 [*]
Midwestern	Alfreeda Goff, Midwestern Collegiate	Jan. 2004 [#]
Missouri Valley	Andrea Myers, Indiana State University	Jan. 2001
Sun Belt	Richard M. Mello, University of Arkansas, Little Rock	Jan. 2003 [*]
Trans American	William C. Bibb, Trans America Athletic Conference	Jan. 2003 [*]
West Coast	Lynda Tealer, Santa Clara University	Jan. 2001 [*]

STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS (Nonvoting members)

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>
West Coast	Brian Dillon, University of the Pacific (California)
Ivy Group	Bola Bamiduro, Columbia University-Barnard College

NCAA staff liaisons:

S. David Berst
Robin J. Green

Division II Presidents Council

(13 members)

Chair—Gladys Styles Johnston

DIVISION I-A

<i>Region</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Region 1	Jessica S. Kozloff, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 2001 [*]
Region 1	Lawrence J. DeNardis, University of New Haven	Jan. 2004 [*]
Region 2	Hazo W. Carter Jr., West Virginia State College	Jan. 2004 [*]
Region 2	Patricia P. Cormier, Longwood College	Jan. 2003 [*]
Region 2	Jerry E. McGee, Wingate University	Jan. 2001 [*]
Region 2	Oscar L. Prater, Fort Valley State University	Jan. 2002 [*]
Region 3	Arend D. Lubbers, Grand Valley State University	Jan. 2003 [*]
Region 3	Albert J. Shannon, St. Joseph's College (Indiana)	Jan. 2001 [*]
Region 4	Charles D. Dunn, Henderson State University	Jan. 2001 [*]
Region 4	Karen W. Morse, Western Washington University	Jan. 2002
Region 4	Kay Schallenkamp, Emporia State University	Jan. 2004

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection)

#Not eligible for reselection by virtue of conference no longer having seat.

At large	Bernard W. Franklin, Virginia Union University	Jan. 2003 [*]
At large	Gladys Styles Johnston, University of Nebraska at Kearney	Jan. 2002 [*]

NCAA staff liaisons:

Mike L. Racy
Jan Brown

Division II Management Council

(24 members)

Chair—Clint Bryant

DIVISION I-A

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
California Collegiate	Pam Gill-Fisher, University of California Davis	Jan. 2004 [*]
Carolinas-Virginia Central	Kaye P. Crooke, Coker College	Jan. 2002 [*]
Intercollegiate Athletic	Dianthia Ford-Kee, Shaw University	Jan. 2001
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic	David W. Coffey, Northwood University	Jan. 2003 [*]
Great Lakes Valley	Kenneth J. Borden, University of Indianapolis	Jan. 2002 [*]
Gulf South	Lisa C. Colvin, Southern Arkansas University	Jan. 2003 [*]
Lone Star	Ed Harris, West Texas A&M University	Jan. 2003 [*]
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic	Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University	Jan. 2002 [#]
New England Collegiate	Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Southern Connecticut State University	Jan. 2001 [*]
New York Collegiate Athletic	Thomas R. Shirley, Philadelphia University	Jan. 2001 [*]
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic	Michael Marcell, North Central Inter-collegiate Athletic Conference	Jan. 2003 [*]
Northeast 10	Kevin L. Hickey, Assumption College	Jan. 2004 [*]
Northern Sun	Katy Wilson, Moorhead State University	Jan. 2004 [*]
Pacific West	Gail Fuels, Humboldt State University	Jan. 2002 [*]
Peach Belt Athletic	Clint Bryant, Augusta State University	Jan. 2003 [#]
Pennsylvania State Athletic	Mary T. Gardner, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 2004 [#]

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection)

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Rocky Mountain Athletic	Barbara J. Schroeder, Regis University (Colorado)	Jan. 2001*
South Atlantic Southern	Doug Echols, South Atlantic Conference	Jan. 2003*
Intercollegiate Athletic	Jean Bell Chandler, Clark Atlanta University	Jan. 2004*
Sunshine State West Virginia	Phil Roach, Rollins College	Jan. 2004*
Intercollegiate Athletic	James W. Watson, West Liberty State College	Jan. 2001*
Independent	Bruce Harger, Drury University	Jan. 2001
At Large	Earl W. Edwards, University of California, San Diego	Jan. 2002*
At Large	Peggy L. Green, Fayetteville State University	Jan. 2002*

NCAA staff liaisons:

Mike L. Racy
Jan Brown

Division III Presidents Council

(15 members)

Chair—Ann H. Die

DIVISION I-A

<i>Region</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Region 1	Ronald L. Applbaum, Kean University	Jan. 2003*
Region 1	John DiBiaggio, Tufts University	Jan. 2001*
Region 1	Robert H. Chambers, Western Maryland College	Jan. 2004*
Region 2	Bette Landman, Beaver College	Jan. 2003*
Region 2	Marlene Springer, College of Staten Island	Jan. 2003*
Region 2	Muriel A. Howard, State University College at Buffalo	Jan. 2004*
Region 3	Stanley P. Caine, Adrian College	Jan. 2002*
Region 3	Thomas B. Courtice, Ohio Wesleyan University	Jan. 2002*
Region 3	Daniel A. DiBiasio, Wilmington College (Ohio)	Jan. 2004*
Region 3	Ann H. Die, Hendrix College	Jan. 2001*
Region 3	Gloria Scott, Bennett College	Jan. 2003*
Region 4	M. Lee Peltan, Willamette University	Jan. 2001*
Region 4	Roy B. Shilling Jr., Southwestern University (Texas)	Jan. 2002
Region 4	Peter W. Stanley, Pomona-Pitzer Colleges	Jan. 2004*
Region 4	Jeanie Watson, Nebraska Wesleyan University	Jan. 2001

NCAA staff liaisons:

Daniel T. Dutcher
Bridget Belgiovine

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection).

NCAA National Office Staff

Executive Team

Cedric W. Dempsey, *President*

Daniel Boggan Jr., *Senior Vice-President*

Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Senior Vice-President*

Governance Staff

S. David Berst, *Chief of Staff for Division I*

Mike L. Racy, *Chief of Staff for Division II*

Daniel T. Dutcher, *Chief of Staff for Division III*

Robin J. Green, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division I*

Jan A. Brown, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division II*

Bridget Belgiovine, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division III*

Lori L. Braa, *Committee Coordinator*

Executive Affairs

Elsa Kircher Cole, *General Counsel*

Marion B. Peavey, *NCAA Foundation Executive Director*

Scott A. Bearby, *Assistant General Counsel*

Shepard C. Cooper, *Director for the NCAA Committee on Infractions*

Robert M. Fiala, *Director of Human Resources*

Lydia L. Sanchez, *Director of Executive Affairs*

D. Sue Hays, *Manager of NCAA Foundation Relations*

Jennifer G. Williams, *Human Resources Coordinator II*

Jody Yelovich, *Human Resources Coordinator*

Championships Group

Tricia Bork, *Vice-President for Championships*

Donna J. Noonan, *Vice-President for the Division I*

Women's Basketball Championship

Sue Donohoe, *Director for the Division I*

Women's Basketball Championship

William R. Hancock, *Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, Administration*

Thomas A. Jacobs, *Director of Championships*

James A. Marchiony, *Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, Media*

Bernard M. Muir, *Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, Operations*

Christine M. Pohl, *Director of Championships*

Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*

Troy Arthur, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Kendyl Baugh, *Assistant Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship*

Mark Bockelman, *Assistant Director of Championships*

R. Wayne Burrow, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Sharon K. Cessna, *Assistant Director of Championships*

John Cochran, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Amy J. Frankenstein, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Nichole D. Manning, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Timothy N. Pavlechko, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Leon A. Smith, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Kristin Whitted, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Education Services Group

Ronald J. Stratten, *Vice-President for Education Services*
Jane C. Meyer, *Director of Education Outreach*
Donnetta H. Moorman, *Director of Professional Development*
Todd A. Petr, *Director of Research*
Edward A. Thiebe, *Director of Youth Programs*
Corey Bray, *Research Coordinator*
Rochelle M. Collins, *Senior Youth Programs Coordinator*
Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Health and Safety*
Patrick Feely, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Mike Gant, *Education Outreach Programs Coordinator*
Lori A. Hendricks, *Education Outreach Programs Coordinator*
Mary J. Johnston, *Librarian*
Aimie Stiener, *Research Analyst*
Mary Wilfert, *Health and Safety Program Coordinator*
Jonathan Williams, *Professional Development Program Coordinator*
Sheila Benton, *Program Coordinator for Education Services*

Enforcement Services

David Price, *Vice-President for Enforcement Services*
David A. Didion, *Director of Enforcement*
Thomas C. Hosty, *Director of Enforcement*
Mark P. Jones, *Director of Enforcement*
Julie Roe-Sumner, *Director of Student-Athlete Reinstatement*
William S. Saum, *Director of Agent, Gambling and Amateurism Activities*
Cristie A. Sexton, *Director of Enforcement*
Douglas Archie, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*
Ronald A. Barker, *Enforcement Representative*
Stacy Brooks, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*
Diane Dennis, *Enforcement Representative*
James A. Elworth, *Enforcement Representative*
Kevin R. Fite, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*
Deana Garner, *Agent, Gambling and Amateurism Activities Representative II*
Jan R. Gentry, *Enforcement Representative*
Stephanie J. Hannah, *Enforcement Representative*
LuAnn Humphrey, *Enforcement Representative*
Richard Johanningmeier, *Enforcement Representative*
Elizabeth Kane, *Enforcement Representative*
Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*
Shawn L. Moore, *Enforcement Representative*
Terry O'Donnell, *Enforcement Representative*

Kevin E. Pearson, *Enforcement Representative*
Jeffrey Scott, *Enforcement Representative*
Amanda D. Schuster, *Enforcement Representative*
Jennifer Strawley, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*
Christopher Strobel, *Enforcement Representative II*
Angelina Torain, *Enforcement Representative*
Laura Wurtz, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*

Finance and Information Services Group

James L. Isch, *Vice-President for Finance and Information Services*
Keith E. Martin, *Director of Finance and Business Operations*
Rhonda Winter, *Director of Information Systems and Technology*
Brad Alderson, *Programmer / Analyst II*
Beth Alstadt, *Accountant II*
Donald Baber, *Programmer / Analyst II*
Anthony A. Babcock, *Programmer / Analyst II*
Kevin Barnett, *Programmer / Analyst*
Steve K. Belcher, *Computer Training Specialist*
Sarah T. Bobert, *Accounting Manager II*
Amanda Brothers, *Programmer / Analyst*
Colin Chapell, *Programmer / Analyst II*
Joyce Collins, *Accountant II*
DeWayne Davis, *Technical Specialist*
Marla B. Gleason, *Operations Manager*
Le'gretta Hinds, *Programmer / Analyst*
Kim Johnson, *Network Administrator*
Connie Justice, *System Administrator*
Michael J. King, *Business Center Manager*
Lynette R. Morasch, *Accounting Manager II*
Sherry L. Neeb, *New Technology Specialist*
Mira Pike, *Manager of Finance and Information Support Services*
Nithya K. Rao, *Database Administrator*
Crystal Reimer, *Finance / Travel Analyst*
Alan J. Riedford, *System Administrator*

Marketing, Licensing and Promotions Group

C. Dennis Cryder, *Vice-President for Marketing, Licensing and Promotions*
Melissa Caito, *Director of Licensing*
John L. Johnson, *Director of Special Events and Promotions*
David A. Knopp, *Director of Corporate Marketing*
JoJo Rinebold, *Director of Broadcast Services*
James W. Shaffer, *Director of Hall of Champions*
Michael K. Bailey, *Assistant Director of Licensing*
Robert M. Dittich, *Manager of Corporate Marketing*
Mary Eiland, *Assistant Director of Promotions*
Chris Farrow, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*
Todd M. Greenwood, *Manager of Sales and Marketing*
Miray Holmes, *Manager of Corporate Marketing*

Kellie Leeman, *Assistant Director of Special Events*
 Frank Losquadro, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*
 Rose Ann Martinez, *Manager of Client Services*
 Kathy Ray, *Operations and Events Manager for Hall of Champions*
 Kim Rivers, *Group Sales Coordinator for Hall of Champions*
 Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service, 119 West 57th*
Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019; 212/541-8840
 Lisa Turner, *Assistant Director of Special Events*
 Donnie Wagner, *Manager of Corporate Marketing*

Membership Services Group

Kevin C. Lennon, *Vice-President for Membership Services*
 Carolyn M. Claude, *Director of Membership Services*
 Diane E. Dickman, *Director of Membership Services*
 Stephen A. Mallonee, *Director of Membership Services*
 Robert A. Oliver, *Director of Membership Services*
 David W. Schnase, *Director of Membership Services*
 Athena Yiamouyiannis, *Director of Membership Services*
 Brad Bertani, *Membership Services Representative*
 Patrick L. Britz, *Membership Services Representative II*
 Randy L. Buhr, *Membership Services Representative*
 Mira J. Colman, *Membership Services Representative*
 Julie L. Cromer, *Membership Services Representative*
 Kristen L. Davis, *Membership Services Representative*
 Gordon C. Finch, *Membership Services Representative*
 Amy Folan, *Membership Services Representative*
 Darrell R. Gordon, *Membership Services Representative*
 Helen C. Grant, *Membership Services Representative*
 Philip D. Grayson, *Membership Services Representative II*
 Jennifer L. Henderson, *Membership Services Representative*
 Lynn M. Holzman, *Membership Services Representative II*
 Brad A. Hostetter, *Membership Services Representative II*
 James R. Johnson, *Membership Services Representative II*
 Damani J. Leech, *Membership Services Representative*
 Chris T. Martin, *Membership Services Representative*
 John G. Morris, *Membership Services Representative II*
 Elizabeth A. Muir, *Membership Services Representative II*
 Denise C. O'Grady, *Membership Services Representative*
 Pete M. Oliszczak, *Membership Services Representative*
 Delise S. O'Meally, *Membership Services Representative*
 Susan J. Peal, *Membership Services Representative*
 Robert G. Phillippi, *Membership Services Representative*
 Lisa E. Roesler, *Membership Services Representative*
 Carol L. Struewing, *Membership Services Representative*
 Wendy A. Walters, *Membership Services Representative*

Public Affairs Group

Danita Edwards, *Vice-President for Public Affairs*
 Doris L. Dixon, *Director of Federal Relations, One Dupont Circle, N.W.,*
Suite 310, Washington, D.C. 20036; 202/293-3050

David Pickle, *Director of Printed Communications*
 Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Public Relations*
 Jim Wright, *Director of Statistics*

Mark Bedics, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Marty Benson, *Publications Editor*
 Gary T. Brown, *The NCAA News Manager*
 Tammi Burke, *Graphic Designer*
 Richard M. Campbell, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Laronica Conway, *Public Information Coordinator*
 Toi Davis, *Graphic Technician II*
 Wayne Davis, *Graphics Manager*
 Scott Deitch, *Publications Editor*
 Michael V. Earle, *Publishing Manager*
 Ty Halpin, *Publications Editor*
 Kay Hawes, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
 Jim Jackson, *Internet Administrator*
 Jane Jankowski, *Public Information Coordinator II*
 Gary K. Johnson, *Senior Statistics Coordinator*
 Melody Lawrence, *Public Information Coordinator*
 Leilana McKindra, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
 Jim McLaughlin, *Graphic Designer II*
 Daniel A. Nestel, *Assistant Director of Federal Relations*
 John Painter, *Publications Editor*
 Jessica Paul, *Graphic Designer*
 Keri Potts, *Publications Editor*
 Jenifer Scheibler, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Sean Straziscar, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Marcia Stubbeman, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
 Heather Yost, *Publications Editor*

■ 94th Annual Convention Delegates and Visitors

Active Member Institutions

Abilene Christian University: Doug Conder, David Merrell, Royce Money
Adams State College: Thomas Gilmore
Adelphi University: Robert E. Hartwell
Adrian College: Stanley P. Carne, Henry C. Mensing
Agnes Scott College: Page Remillard
University of Alabama at Birmingham: Rose Scripa
University of Alabama, Huntsville: Jim Harris, Shelia Ray
Alabama A&M University: Betty K. Austin, James A. Martin
University of Alaska Anchorage: Dede Allen, Harry Larrabee
University of Alaska Fairbanks: Rick Goeb, Karen Jones, Randy Pitney, Janice Reynolds
State University of New York at Albany: Kenneth Dyer
Albany State University (Georgia): Kenneth Dryer, Dan Land, Stephanie Harrison
Albertus Magnus College: Joseph Tonelli
Albion College: Beth Lincoln
Albright College: Sally A. Stetler, Jeffrey H. Woodward
Alcorn State University: Lloyd Hill, Alecia Shields-Gadson
Alderson-Broadus College: Paul Bennett
Alfred University: Karen L. Johnson
Allegheny College: Richard Creehan
Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales: Joy Richman
Alma College: Denny Griffin, James Kridler
Alvernia College: Adam Hertz
American International College: Robert E. Burke
American University: Lee McElroy
American University of Puerto Rico: Jose Lopez
Amherst College: Peter Gooding
Armstrong Atlantic State University: Eddie Aenchracher, Frank A. Butler
Anderson College (South Carolina): Robert Beville, Harry Lehwald, Jason Moorhead
Anderson University (Indiana): Barrett Bates, Becky Hull, Doyle Lucas
Angelo State University: James Hindman, Kathleen M. Price, Michael Ryan, Jerry C. Vandergriff
University of Arizona: Jim Livengood, Dudley Woodard
Arizona State University: Jerry Kingston, Betsy Mosher, Kevin White
University of Arkansas, Monticello: Morris Bramlett, Fred Taylor

University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff: Vannette W. Johnson
 Arkansas State University: Barry Dowd, Les Wyatt
 Arkansas Tech University: Brent Good, Ken Rogers
 Ashland University: William G. Benz, Bill Goldring, Sue Uebel
 Assumption College: Rita Castagna
 Auburn University: Barbara Camp, Dennis Wilson
 Augsburg College: Marilyn Florian, Chris W. Kimball
 Augusta State University: William A. Bloodworth Jr., Mary Lisko,
 Melissa Mullins
 Augustana College (Illinois): Liesl Fowler
 Augustana College (South Dakota): Bill Gross
 Aurora University: Mark V. Walsh
 Austin College: Tim Millerick, Jack Pierce
 Averett College: Vesa Hiltunen

Babson College: Francis Millerick
 Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis Barone
 Ball State University: John Reno
 Bard College: Scott Swere
 Barry University: Michael Covone
 Bates College: Suzanne R. Coffey, Marsha Graef
 Baylor University: David Guinn
 Beaver College: Stan Exeter, Bette Landman, Shirley Liddle
 Bellarmine College: Ann M. Jirkovsky, David P. O'Toole
 Benedictine University (Illinois): John Ostrowski, John J. Stachniak
 Bennett College: Carl A. Bibbs, Brooke Meadows, Gloria Scott
 Bentley College: Sandy Hoffman
 Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng
 Bethany College (West Virginia): Wallace Neel
 Bethel College (Minnesota): Dave Klostreich
 Bethune-Cookman College: Floyd W. Laisure
 State University of New York at Binghamton: Matthew Bassett,
 Alicia Goode, Dennis Lasser, Joel Thirer
 Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Preston
 Herring, Jessica Kozloff
 Bluefield State College: Roger Owensby
 Bluffton College: Denny J. Weaver
 Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Marcia Wicklow-Howard
 Boston College: Gene DeFilippo
 Bowie State University: David Thomas
 Brandeis University: Jeffrey Cohen, Sheryl Sousa
 University of Bridgeport: Joseph J. DiPuma
 Bridgewater College (Virginia): Tom Kinder
 Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): John Harper
 Brigham Young University, Hawaii: Bandy Day, Ron Jackson, Eric
 Shumway
 State University College at Brockport: Linda Case, Susan Hoffman
 State University of New York at Buffalo: Bob Arkeilpane

Brooklyn College: Bruce Filosa
 Bryant College: Daniel Gavitt
 Bryn Mawr College: Barbara Bolich, Amy Campbell
 Buena Vista University: Peggy Chown, Jan Travis, Marge Willadsen
 State University College at Buffalo: Jerry S. Boyes, Muriel Howard

Cabrini College: Leslie Danehy
 University of California, Berkeley: John Kasser
 University of California, Davis: Pam Gill-Fisher, Melvin Ramey, Greg
 Warzecka, Suzanne Williams
 University of California, Irvine: Dan Guerrero, John Hauscarriague,
 Peterina Long, Lyman Porter
 University of California, Los Angeles: Peter Dalis, Betsy Stephenson
 University of California, Riverside: Cliff Dochterman, Stan Morrison
 University of California, San Diego: Lea Rudee, Regina Sullivan
 University of California, Santa Barbara: Gary Cunningham
 University of California, Santa Cruz: Mark Majeski
 California Institute of Technology: Tim Downes, Wendell Jack, Karen
 Nelson
 California Lutheran University: Bruce Bryde
 California Polytechnic State University: Alison Cone, John
 McCutcheon
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Frank Gibbons,
 Fred D. Henderson, Karen L. Miller
 California State University, Bakersfield: Tomas A. Arciniega, Rudy
 Carvajal, Brian McNamarra
 California State University, Chico: Anita S. Barker, Don W. Batie,
 Richard Parker
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Hal Charnofsky, Ron
 Prettyman, Julie Sandoval
 California State University, Fresno: Allen Bohl, Diane Milutinovich
 California State University, Fullerton: John Easterbrook, Leon
 Gilbert, Robert L. Palmer
 California State University, Los Angeles: Gerald A. Beer, Brian R.
 Swanson
 California State University, Northridge: Annagrace Collins, Richard
 Dull, Thomas Shannon
 California State University, San Bernardino: Bonnie Belfield, Barry
 Knight, Nancy Simpson
 California State University, Stanislaus: Kim Duyst, Marvalene
 Hughes, Milton Richards
 California University of Pennsylvania: Thomas Pucci
 Calvin College: Mary Flikkema, Nancy Meyer
 Cameron University: Sam Carroll, Don Davis, Don Sullivan, Kim
 Vinson, Robert Ziegler
 Campbell University: Tom Collins
 Capital University: Jane Baldwin, Roger Welsh
 Carleton College: Leon Lunder

Carnegie Mellon University: John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser
 Carson-Newman College: Charles T. King Jr.
 Carthage College: Robert Bonn
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, Dave Hutter, Glenn Nicholls
 Castleton State College: Deanna Tyson
 Catawba College: Dennis W. Davidson
 Centenary College (Louisiana): Julia Dunn, Travis Feezell, Craig Gunsul
 Centenary College (New Jersey): Diane Finnan
 University of Central Arkansas: William Bandy, Mary Ann Schlientz
 Central College (Iowa): Al Dorenkamp, Ed Willis
 Central Connecticut State University: Michael Ansarra, Douglas Carter, Charles Jones Jr., Lisa Meyers
 Central Missouri State University: Paul Englemann, Jerry Hughes, Cindy Parks, Bobby Patton
 University of Central Oklahoma: Jeff McKibbin, Charles Strumbaugh, John "Skip" Wagon
 Central Washington University: Michael Champagne, Rob Perkins
 Centre College: Kitty Baird, Joe McDaniel, Gina Nicoletti, John Roush
 Chadron State College: Tom Krepel, Brad Smith
 Chaminade University: Wayne Tanna
 Chapman University: David Currey, Penny Brush
 Chatham College: Norcen O'Malley
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Clinton W. Pettus, Gregory Smith
 University of Chicago: Starkey Duncan, Rosalie Resch, Lorna Straus, Tom Weingartner
 Chicago State University: Al Avant, Jerald Henderson
 Chowan College: Steven Lee
 Christian Brothers University: Michael Daush, Joe Nadicksbernd, Brother Stanislaus Sobczyk
 University of Cincinnati: Nancy Hamant
 City College of New York: Robert Coleman
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Georgette DeVeres, Michael Sutton
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Bob Carlson, Tracy Cumming, Isch Krauss
 Clark Atlanta University: Jean Chandler, Richard Cosby, Edward Davis, Phillip Hood
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda Moulton
 Clarkson University: Geoffrey Brown
 Clayton College & State University: Mason Barfield, Patrick O'Hare, Mike Vollmer
 Coker College: Deborah Griggs, Tim Griggs
 Colby College: Marcella Zalot
 Colby-Sawyer College: Deborah McGrath
 University of Colorado, Colorado Springs: Linda Bunnell Shade, Randy Cubero

Colorado Christian University: Dave Foster
 Colorado College: Ralph Bertrand, Roxanne Dale, Martin Scarano
 Colorado School of Mines: Theodore Bickart, John Hogan, Marvin Kay
 Colorado State University: Marsha Smeltzer, Christine Susemihl, Tim Weiser
 Columbia Union College: Richard Murray
 Concord College: Ron Burgher
 Concordia College, Moorhead: Armin Pipho
 Concordia University (Illinois): Janet Fisher
 University of Connecticut: Kenneth McBryde, Anne Parmenter
 Cornell College: Steve Miller
 State University College at Cortland: Joel Maxcy, Lee Roberts, Judson Taylor
 Curry College: Vincent Eruzione

 University of Dallas: Joseph Milam, Richard Strockbine, Fred Zuker
 Dartmouth College: Jo Ann Harper
 Davis and Elkins College: Will Shaw
 Defiance College: James T. Harris, Dick Kaiser, Steve Sondergaard
 Delaware State University: Dwayne Henry, Germaine McAuley
 Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang
 Delta State University: Jim Jordan, David Potter, Mike Thompson, Kent Wyatt
 University of Denver: Diane Murphy, Nancy Sampson
 DePauw University: Page Cotton
 Dickinson College: Judy Yorio
 University of District of Columbia: Alvin Darby
 Dominican College (New York): Joe Clinton, John Lounibos
 Drew University: Vincent Masco, Connee Zotos
 Drexel University: Jill Axel, Nick Gannon, Laura White
 Drury University: Penny Clayton
 University of Dubuque: Dennis Rima

 Earlham College: Porter Miller
 East Central University: Tim Green, Marc Petrowsky
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Diane Husic, Carey J. Snyder
 East Texas Baptist University: Bob E. Riley
 Eastern Connecticut State University: Stacey Close, Michael Pernal, Joyce Wong, David Yeo
 Eastern Kentucky University: Derita Ratcliffe
 Eastern Mennonite University: Robert Roeschley
 Eastern New Mexico University: Thurman Elder, Rosie Stallman
 Eastern Oregon University: Peggy Anderson
 Eastern Washington University: Scott Barnes, Frank E. Nelson, Judith Penrod Siminow
 Eckerd College: Jim Harley

Edgewood College: Tim Alexander
 Elizabeth City State University: Claudie Mackey, Edward McLean
 Elizabethtown College: Nancy Latimore
 Elmhurst College: Christopher Ragsdale
 Elmira College: Pat Thompson
 Elon College: Alan White
 Emerson College: Rick Bagby, Kristin Parnell
 Emory and Henry College: Tom Fowlkes
 Emory University: Chuck Gordon, Jenny McDowell
 Emporia State University: Wilma Kasnic, John Rich, Kay Schallenkamp, Kent Weiser
 Endicott College: Larry Hiser
 Erskine College: Wilber H. Reames Jr.
 Eureka College: Joe Barth

Fairfield University: Eugene Doris
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: William Klika Jr.
 Fairmont State College: Dave Cooper
 Fayetteville State University: Horace Small, Clarence White
 Ferris State University: Tom Kirinovic
 Ferrum College: Ted Kinder
 Fisk University: Gorge Neely Jr.
 Fitchburg State College: Sue Lauder
 University of Florida: Jamie McCloskey
 Florida Atlantic University: Thomas Cargill, Dorothy Leland
 Florida Institute of Technology: William Jurgens
 Florida Southern College: Harold "Hal" Smetzly
 Florida State University: Bob Minnix
 Fontbonne College: Lee McKinney
 Fordham University: George Bisaca
 Fort Hays State University: Edward H. Hammond, Glen McNeil
 Fort Lewis College: Kendall Blanchard, Duane Smith, Joel R. Smith
 Fort Valley State University: Edmond Wyche, Oscar Prater, Gwendolyn Reeves
 Framingham State College: Tom Kelly
 Francis Marion University: Gerald Griffin
 Franklin & Marshall College: John Andrew, Patty Epps, Bill Marshall
 Franklin College: Tom Hodge
 Franklin Pierce College: Bruce Kirsh
 State University College at Fredonia: Dennis Hefner, Greg Precht
 Frostburg State University: Diane Morea

Gallaudet University: Richard Pelletier
 Gannon University: Michael Corbett
 Gardner-Webb University: Chuck Burch, Jeff Tubbs
 State University College at Geneseo: Christopher Dahl, Marilyn Moore
 George Fox University: Craig Taylor

George Mason University: Thomas J. O'Connor
 George Washington University: Susie Jones
 Georgetown University: Patricia Thomas
 University of Georgia: Michael Adams, Gary Couvillon, Vince Dooley, Damon Evans
 Georgia College & State University: Stan Aldridge, Jerry Fly
 Georgia Southern University: Bruce Grube, Richard Rogers
 Gettysburg College: Chuck Winters
 Glenville State College: Wayne DeRosset
 Gonzaga University: Michael Roth
 Goucher College: Robert Lewand, Geoffrey Miller
 Grambling State University: Wilbert Ellis, Lane A. Howell, David Lewis
 Grand Canyon University: Keith Baker, Claude Pensis
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Arend D. Lubbers, Tim Selgo, Don Vander Jagt
 Greensboro College: Jean Lojko, Kim Strable
 Greenville College: Doug Faulkner
 Grove City College: Christopher W. Smith
 Gustavus Adolphus College: Al Molde

Hamilton College: Sue Viscomi
 Hamline University: Katharine Romme
 Hampden-Sydney College: Joseph E. Bush
 Hampton University: Dennes E. Thomas
 Hanover College: Lynn Hall
 Harding University: David Burks, Greg Harnden, Wilt Martin
 Hardin-Simmons University: John Neese
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler
 Haverford College: Charles Miller
 University of Hawaii at Hilo: William Trumbo
 University of Hawaii, Manoa: Kaia Hedlund, Steve Martin, Marilyn Moniz-Kahoonohano
 Hawaii Pacific University: Neil Morfitt
 Heidelberg College: Martin Reno
 Henderson State University: Charles Dunn, David Gardner, Ken Turner
 Hendrix College: Ann H. Die, Glenn Tourville
 Hilbert College: Richard L. Walsh
 Hillsdale College: Mickey Craig, Michael Kovalchik
 Hiram College: Ben Oliver, Bobby Thomas
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Joseph Berta, Clarence Butler, Mike Hanna
 College of the Holy Cross: Richard Regan
 Hood College: Eric Dennis
 Hope College: Amanda Heydon, Anne Irwin, Raymond Smith, John Van Iwaarden
 Howard Payne University: Phil Fuller, Rick Gregory

Howard University: Morris Hawkins Jr., Sondra Norrell-Thomas,
Altha Williamson
Humboldt State University: Mike Swan
Hunter College: Terry Wansart

University of Idaho: Mike Bohn
Idaho State University: Howard Guthrie
Illinois College: William Merris
Illinois Wesleyan University: Jack Fields
Immaculata College: Lynne Reichert
University of the Incarnate Word: Howard Patterson, Tina Patterson
Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Frank Condino, Steven Ender,
Harold Goldsmith, Frances Nee, Lawrence Pettit
Indiana University, Bloomington: William C. Perkins
Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis: Michael
Moore
University of Indianapolis: David Huffman, Sue Willey
Iona College: Rich Petriccione
University of Iowa: Fred Mims
Iowa State University: Elaine J. Hieber
Ithaca College: Henry Newbert, John Oblak

Jackson State University: Robert Braddy Sr., Edmond Donald
James Madison University: Janet Lucas
John Carroll University: Tony DeCarlo, Gretchen Weitbrecht
John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin
Johns Hopkins University: Thomas Calder, Faith Shearer
Johnson and Wales University: Thomas M. Carmody, John Parente
Johnson C. Smith University: Eugene Hermitte, Catherine Wright
Juniata College: Lawrence Bock

Kalamazoo College: Marilyn Maurer
University of Kansas: Don Green
Kansas State University: Cindy Fox, Mike Holen
Kean University: Ronald Applbaum, Pat Hannisch, Glenn Hedden
Keene State College: John Ratliff
Kennesaw State University: Dave Waples
Kent State University: Carol Cartwright, Judy Devine
University of Kentucky: Kathy DeBoer, John Piccoro, Charles
Wethington
Kentucky State University: Donald W. Lyons, Derrick Ramsey, G. W.
Reid
Kenyon College: Wendi Weimer
King's College (Pennsylvania): Cheryl Ish, Janet Mercincavage
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Clark S. Yeager, Robert C.
Ziegenfus.

La Roche College: Linda Jordan, William Kerr, Jim Tinkey

University of La Verne: Jim Paschal, Rick Simon
Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson, David R. Johnson
Lake Erie College: Robert C. Benz, Mary Ann Naso, James
Schweickert
Lake Forest College: Jackie Sloats
Lake Superior State University: William Crawford, Charles Jones
Lakeland College: Cheryl Pasbrig
Lander University: Jeff May
Lane College: J. L. Perry
Lasell College: Kristy Walter
Lawrence University: Dave Brown
Le Moyne College: Richards W. Rockwell, Shawn L. Ward
Lebanon Valley College: Louis Sorrentino, Kathleen Tierney
Lees-McRae College: Ried M. Estus, Earl J. Robinson, Mary Wefer
White
LeMoyne-Owen College: E. D. Wilkens
Lenoir-Rhyne College: Rufus Moretz, Joe L. Smith
Lewis and Clark College: Nora Beck, Judy McMullen, Steve Wallo
Lewis University: Raphael Mascia, Paul Ruddy
Limestone College: Michael Cerino
Lincoln Memorial University: Jerry Bishop
Lincoln University (Missouri): Theresa Ferguson, David B. Henson,
Robert Robinson
Linfield College: Scott Carnahan
Livingstone College: Clifton Huff
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Sharon E. Taylor
Long Beach State University: William Shumard, Mary Ann Tripodi
Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus: Vincent Salamone
Longwood College: Patricia Cormier, Sally Gilfillan, Donald Lemish,
Ellen Moss
Loras College: Greg Capell
Louisiana College: Rory Lee
University of Louisville: Neil Brooks, Julie Hermann, Kevin Miller,
John Shumaker, Elaine Wise
Loyola Marymount University: William S. Husak
Luther College: Joe Thompson
Lynchburg College: Jack Toms, Charles Warren
Lynn University: James D. Matthews, Richard A. Young

Macalester College: Irv Cross, John Leaney, Jack Rossmann, Vanessa
Selieskog
Maine Maritime Academy: William J. Mottola
Manchester College: Tom Jarman, Martha Judge, David Kreps
Manhattan College: Richard Berman, Robert J. Byrnes, Sandra
Sapone
Manhattanville College: Lawson Bowling, Sean T. Frazier
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Roger Maisner
Maranatha Baptist Bible College: Ben Wright

Marist College: Chandra Bierwirth, Tim Murray
 Marquette University: Gregory J. Naples, Kathryn Statz
 Mars Hill College: David Riggins
 University of Maryland, College Park: Charles F. Welford
 University of Maryland, Eastern Shore: Henry Brooks, Hallie E. Gregory, Monique Morga
 Mary Washington College: Edward H. Hegmenn
 Maryville University of Saint Louis: Anne Leser, David Pierce, Kathleen Quinn
 Marywood University: Mary Jo Gunning
 University of Massachusetts, Amherst: Thorr Bjorn
 University of Massachusetts, Boston: Henry Long Jr., Pam Samuelson
 University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth: Robert Mullen
 University of Massachusetts at Lowell: Jon Hellstedt, Dana Skinner
 Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts: Scott Nichols
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Thomas J. Allen, John Benedick, Jean Heiney, Richard A. Hill
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy: LeRoy Thompson
 McMurry University: Bob Kuzma, Marvin Stringfellow
 Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson
 University of Memphis: V. Lane Rawlins
 Mercy College: Neil Judge
 Mercyhurst College: Pete Russo
 Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio
 Mesa State College: Michael Gallagher, Douglas Schakel
 Messiah College: Jerry Chaplin, Amy Weaver
 Methodist College: Robert McEvoy
 Metropolitan State College of Denver: Joan McDermott
 University of Miami (Florida): Paul Dee
 University of Michigan: Tom Goss, Derrick Grass
 Michigan Technological University: Michele H. Miller, Suzanne R. Sanregret, Richard Yeo
 Middle Tennessee State University: Race Bergman, Lee Fowler
 Middlebury College: Russ Reilly, Gail Smith
 Midwestern State University: Robert McBee, Lou Rodriguez, Ricky Williams
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Daniel Audette, Thomas Greco
 Mills College: Helen Carroll
 Millsaps College: George M. Harnum, Ron Jurney
 Milwaukee School of Engineering: Dan Harris
 University of Minnesota, Duluth: Robert Corran
 University of Minnesota, Morris: Mark Fohl
 University of Minnesota, Twin Cities: Norman Chervany, Chris Schoemann
 Minnesota State University-Mankato: Ron Hybertson, Malcolm O'Sullivan, Sue Reinders, Richard R. Rush

College Misericordia: Michael Mould
 University of Mississippi: John W. Shafer, Robert A. Weems
 Mississippi College: Anita Gowin, Terry McMillan, Howell Todd
 Mississippi University for Women: Jo Spearman
 Mississippi Valley State University: Pauline Banks, Chuck Prophet
 University of Missouri, Columbia: Sarah Reesman, Carl Settergren
 University of Missouri, Kansas City: Robert Thomas
 University of Missouri, Rolla: Lawrence Christensen, Mark Mullin, Wendell Ogrosky, Sarah Preston
 University of Missouri, St. Louis: Patricia Dolan
 Missouri Southern State College: Sallie Beard, Jim Frazier, John Tiede
 Missouri Western State College: Pete Chapman, Mark Linder
 Molloy College: Robert C. Houlihan, Sheila Kelly
 University of Montana: George M. Dennison, Wayne Hogan
 Montana State University-Billings: Gary Gray, Russell Lord
 Montclair State University: Holly Gera, Anita Kubricka
 University of Montevallo: Roy Culberson, Robert McChesney
 Moorhead State University: Marlane Sanderson, Kathryn Wilson
 Moravian College: Paul Moyer
 Morehead State University: Michael Brown, Ronald Eaglin
 Morehouse College: Dianne Williams-Watkins
 Morningside College: Chuck Baughman, Beth A. Sibenaller
 Morris Brown College: Corine Hyman, Johnie Myers
 Mount Holyoke College: Carol Anne Beach, Laurie Priest
 Mount Olive College: Mac Cassell
 College of Mount St. Joseph: Steven Radcliffe, Georgana Taggart
 Mount St. Mary College (New York): John Wright
 Mount Union College: Truman Turnquist
 Muhlenberg College: Rudolph Ehrenberg, Steven Erber, Connie Kunda
 Murray State University: Christian Pope
 Nazareth College: Peter Bothner, Annette Shapiro
 University of Nebraska at Kearney: Bruce Elder, Gladys Styles Johnston, Laure Smith, Michael Sumpter
 University of Nebraska, Lincoln: Bob Burton, Barbara Hibner, Josephine R. Potuto
 University of Nebraska, Omaha: Nancy Belck, Robert Danenhauer, Cherri Mankenberg, William Wakefield
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Jeanie Watson, Ira Zeff
 Neumann College: Sandra Slabik
 University of Nevada: Joe Crowley, Chris Exline
 University of New England: Dennis Leighton, Karol L'Heureaux, Lori Runksmeier
 University of New Hampshire: David O'Connor
 New Hampshire College: Chip Polak
 University of New Haven: Deborah Chin
 College of New Jersey: Kevin McHugh

New Jersey City University: Larry Schiner
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: Joel Bloom
 University of New Mexico: Rudy Davalos, William McGillis
 New Mexico Highland University: Roy Lujan, Joe Singleton
 New Mexico State University: Joe Creed, Brian D. Faison, Karen L. Fey
 State University College at New Paltz: Farron Bennett, James Zalacca
 New York Institute of Technology: James Catalano, Clyde M. Doughty Jr.
 New York Maritime College: James Migli
 New York University: Christopher Bledsoe
 Newberry College: Peggy Barnes
 Niagara University: Michael Hermann
 Nicholls State University: Stan Williamson
 Nichols College: Charlyn Robert, Joanne Williams
 University of North Alabama: Robert Potts, Dan Summy
 University of North Carolina, Asheville: Tom Hunnicutt
 University of North Carolina, Charlotte: David Goldfield
 University of North Carolina, Greensboro: Nelson Bobb, David Knight
 University of North Carolina at Pembroke: Susan Edkins, Dan Kenney, Allen C. Meadors
 North Carolina A&T State University: Alfonso Scandrett, Holly Trexler
 North Carolina Central University: Leslie Brinson, Ingrid Wicker, William Lide
 North Central College: Les Brinson, Harold Wilde
 University of North Dakota: Phil Harmeson, Charles Kupchella, Kathy McCann, Roger Thomas
 North Dakota State University: Robert Entizon, Thomas Riley
 University of North Florida: Richard E. Gropper, Kathy Klein
 Northeast Louisiana University: Warner Alford
 Northeastern State University: Gil Cloud, Matt Cochran, Larry Williams
 Northern Arizona University: Steve Holton
 University of Northern Colorado: Jim Falls, Bob Heiny, Julie Warrington
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas Kearns, Jane Meier
 Northern Michigan University: Jim Suksi, Brian Verigin
 Northern State University: William Haigh, Robert Olson, Lisa Schriver
 Northwest Missouri State University: Russ Northup, James Redd
 Norwich University: Anthony Mariano
 College of Notre Dame (Maryland): Margie Tversky
 Oberlin College: Michael Muska
 Occidental College: John Sweet

Oglethorpe University: Robert Unger
 Ohio Northern University: Gayle E. Lauth, Thomas E. Simmons, Ellen S. Wilson
 Ohio State University: Archie Griffin
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Thomas "Tom" Courtice, Justin Kronewetter
 University of Oklahoma: Dan Gibbens
 Oklahoma Panhandle State University: Kevin Emerick, John W. Goodwin, Kathleen Turner
 Oklahoma State University: Rick Allen
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Baile, Janis Sanchez
 State University College at Old Westbury: Edward Wolfarth
 Olivet College: Nancy Van Hoozier, Charles Wilson
 State University College at Oneonta: Carol Blazina
 University of Oregon: Dave Frohnmayer, Gary Gray
 State University College at Oswego: Sandra L. Moore
 Otterbein College: Doug Welsh
 Ouachita Baptist University: David Sharp
 University of the Ozarks (Arkansas): Jim Abbuhl, Rick Niece, Buddy Smith
 Pace University: David Bierwirth, Joseph F. O'Donnell
 University of the Pacific (California): Kenneth Beauchamp, Allison Freedman, Cindy Saro
 Pacific Lutheran University: Paul E. Hoseth
 Pacific University (Oregon): Ken Schumann, Judy Sherman
 Pennsylvania State University: John Coyle, Graham B. Spanier
 Pennsylvania State University Erie, the Behrend College: John Lilley, Timothy Smaby, Brian Streeter
 Piedmont College: Ray Cloere, Ken Mellencar, Rene Van Winkle
 Pittsburg State University: Tom Bryant, Elwyn Davis, Shannon Schmiege
 University of Pittsburgh, Bradford: Richard Frederick, Lori Mazza, Richard McDowell
 University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown: Anthony Capon
 Plattsburgh State University of New York: Larry Cowan, Horace Judson, Peter Luguri, Michael Miranda, Phoebe A. Sturm
 Plymouth State College: Steve Bamford, Moira Long
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Dan Bridges
 University of Portland: Joseph Etzel, David D. Tyson
 Portland State University: Jim Sterk
 State University College at Potsdam: Carol Heinick, William Kaiser
 Presbyterian College: J. Allen Morris
 Principia College: Bob Beeman, Lenore Suarez
 Purdue University: Elliott Blumenthal, Walter Bowman, David Skelton

Queens College (New York): Allen Lee Sessoms, Richard Wettan

Quincy University: John Coats
Quinnipiac College: Jack McDonald

Ramapo College: Eugene Marshall Jr., Michael Ricciardi
Randolph-Macon College: Sue Bias, Jeff Burns, Gregg Waters
Randolph-Macon Woman's College: Valerie Cushman
University of Redlands: James Appleton, Carl Clapp, Caryl Foristall,
Jeffery Martinez
Regis University (Colorado): Tom Dadin
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte
University of Rhode Island: Paul Kassabian, Amy Klopfenstein,
Donald McCreight, Donald Tencher
Rhodes College: Mike Clary, Sarah Hatgas
Rice University: James Castaneda, Alan Chapman
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey: Susan Newcomb
University of Richmond: Ruth Goehring
Rider University: Curtis Blake, Nancy Lee Roberts
Rivier College: Joanne Merrill
Roanoke College: Scott Allison
University of Rochester: Timothy Hale, George VanderZwaag
Rochester Institute of Technology: Janet E. Jones, Louis W. Spiotti
Rockford College: Kristyn King
Rockhurst University: Peter Bicak
Roger Williams University: William Baird
Rollins College: Phillip Roach
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Gregg Ruark
Rosemont College: Pamela Wojnar
Rowan University: Ed Streb, Marguerite Stubbs
Russell Sage College: Candice Poiss
Rust College: David Beckley
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark: Kim Allen

Saginaw Valley State University: George Eastland, Camille
Rutherford, Richard Thompson
St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Rich Johnson
Saint Anselm College: Edward Cannon
St. Augustine's College: Wanzo F. Hendrix
College of St. Benedict: Carol Howe-Veenstra, Lu Ann Reif
College of St. Catherine: Shelia Brown
St. Cloud State University: Susan Becker, Art Grachek, Shawna
Hutchins, Morris Kurtz
St. Edward's University: John Knorr, James F. Smith, Debora
Williamson
St. John Fisher College: Norman Kieffer
St. John's University (Minnesota): Kenneth Jones
St. Joseph College (Connecticut): William E. Cardarelli
Saint Joseph's College (Indiana): Camie Bechtold, Linda Deno, Bill
Massoels, Teresa Massoels, Albert Shannon

St. Joseph's College (New York): Donald Lizak
St. Joseph's University: Don DiJulia
St. Lawrence University: Margie Strait, Jim Wallace
St. Leo University: Francis X. Reidy
St. Mary's College (California): Linda Anderson, Rick Mazzuto
Saint Mary's College (Indiana): Lynn A. Kachmarik
St. Mary's College of Maryland: Jason Hurley
St. Mary's University (Texas): Steve Johnson, Katherine M. Sisoian
St. Michael's College: Geri Knortz
St. Olaf College: Cindy Book
St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi, April Emory
St. Peter's College: Kim Culligan, William Stein
College of Saint Rose: Cathy Haker
University of St. Thomas (Minnesota): JoAnn Andregg
Salem State College: John Galaris, Nash G. Nunn
Salem-Teikyo University: Gary McAllister, Louis Talerico
Salve Regina University: Del Malloy, John Rok
Samford University: Robert Roller
University of San Diego: Tom Iannacone, Mitchell Malachowsky
San Diego State University: Justina Boyd
University of San Francisco: Bill Hogan
San Francisco State University: Patricia Bartscher, Kathleen
Heitzman, Michael Simpson
Savannah College of Art and Design: Matt Honeycutt, Linda Lewis,
Jim Matthews
Seattle Pacific University: Tom Box, Robert Huber
Shaw University: Ernest L. Pickens
Shepherd College: Barbara E. Beard
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: George Harper, Roberta
Page, James Pribula
Simpson College: Bruce Sloan
Skidmore College: Tim Brown
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, Paul
Lueken, Peter Salteri
Smith College: Lynn Oberbillig
Sonoma State University: William Crowley, Bill Fusco
University of the South: Nancy Ladd, Bob Pearigen, Mark Webb
University of South Carolina at Aiken: Randy Warrick
University of South Carolina, Columbia: Susie VanHuss
University of South Carolina-Spartanburg: Mike Hall, John
Stockwell
South Carolina State University: Timothy J. Autry, Leroy Davis
University of South Dakota: Kelly Higgins, Jack Powell, Kim Zarling
South Dakota State University: Mylo Hellickson, Fred Oien
Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
Southeast Missouri State University: Kenneth Dobbins, Donald
Kaverman, Georganne Syler
Southeastern Oklahoma State University: Donald Parham, Jerry
Polson

Southern Arkansas University: Jay Adcox, Steve Dingman, Steve Gamble
 University of Southern Colorado: Marsha Blowers, Tito Guerrero III, Stanley Perchan
 Southern Connecticut State University: Antonio Aceto, Patricia Nicol, Darryl Rogers
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Cynthia L. Jones, John B. Meisel, David J. Werner
 University of Southern Indiana: Jackson Marr, Steve Newton
 University of Southern Maine: Albert D. Bean Jr., Richard L. Pattenaude
 Southern Methodist University: Charles Howard
 Southern University, Baton Rouge: Dana Carpenter, Dena Davis, Moses Dupre, Brenda Edmond
 Southern Utah University: Jack Bishop, David Braeger
 Southern Vermont College: Scott Kilgallon
 Southwest Baptist University: Paul E. Parker, Dennis Roland, Pat Taylor, Joanne Vaughan
 Southwest State University: Rosalie Miller, Lloyd Raymond
 Southwestern Oklahoma State University: Kelli Litsch
 Southwestern University (Texas): Sherri H. Babcock, Glada C. Hunt, Roy B. Shilling Jr.
 Springfield College: Richard Flynn, Betty Mann, Craig Poissen, Dana Rieger, Cathie Schweitzer
 Stanford University: Cheryl L. Levick, Jerry I. Porra
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Steve McCarty, Baker Pattillo
 Stephens College: Marcia Kierscht
 Stevens Institute of Technology: Dean M. Witty
 Stillman College: Donald Staffo, Sharon E. Whittaker
 Stonehill College: Paula Sullivan
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Sul Ross State University: Kay Whitley
 Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum
 Swarthmore College: Robert Williams
 Sweet Briar College: Jennifer Crispen
 Syracuse University: Kenneth Shaw, Michael Wasylenko

 University of Tampa: Larry Marfise, Gil Swalls
 Tarleton State University: Susan Burton, Lamar Johanson, Dennis McCabe, Lonnie McMillan
 University of Tennessee at Chattanooga: Oval Jaynes
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville: Joan Cronan, Doug Dickey
 University of Tennessee at Martin: Phillip W. Conn
 Tennessee State University: James Hefner, James Smith
 University of Texas at Arlington: Pete Carlon
 University of Texas at Austin: DeLoss Dodds, Patricia Ohlendorf, Leroy Sutherland, Charles Alan Wright
 University of Texas, Pan American: William Weidner

Texas A&M University, College Station: Thomas Adair
 Texas A&M University-Commerce: Randy McBroom, Keith McFarland, Tom Tallach
 Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi: Wayne Bridgeman, Robert R. Furgason, Sandra Harper, Dan Viola
 Texas A&M University-Kingsville: Livia Diaz, Randy Hughes, Gil Wright
 Texas Christian University: Rhonda Hatcher
 Texas Lutheran College: Kim Callicoatte, John Masterson, Jon Moline
 Texas Southern University: Rhonda S. Powell
 Texas Tech University: Judi Henry, Shane Lyons, Robert Sweazy
 Texas Wesleyan University: Skip Applin
 Texas Woman's University: Richard Nicholas, Judy Southard, Frank Vitro
 Thiel College: David A. Armstrong
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton, Robin L. Sheppard
 Trinity College (District of Columbia): Christy Neff
 Trinity University (Texas): Bob King
 Troy State University: John Williams
 Truman State University: Mary Sue Beersman, Kathy Turpin, Jerry Wollmering
 Tufts University: Rocco Carzo, John DiBiaggio, William Gehling
 Tulane University: Monica Love
 University of Tulsa: Robert Lawless
 Tusculum College: Ed Hoffmeyer
 Tuskegee University: Roderick Randolph

 Union College (New York): Richard Sakala
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Ray Cieplik
 U.S. Merchant Marine Academy: Susan Petersen Lubow
 U.S. Naval Academy: Tom Bates, Dick Mathieu
 Upper Iowa University: Paul Rudolph
 Ursinus College: Carrie Reilly, John Strassburger
 University of Utah: Larry Gerlach
 Utah State University: Mary Ellen Cloninger, George Emert, Michael Parent, Kenneth White
 Utica College: Todd Hutton, James Spartano
 Valdosta State University: Herbert Reinhard, Charles Tucker
 Valparaiso University: Bill Steinbrecher
 Vanderbilt University: Thomas Burish, Todd Turner, Joe Wyatt
 Vassar College: Andy Jennings, Louise McCleary, Ellen Shilkret
 Virginia Military Institute: Donny White
 Virginia State University: Edward Cooper, Claude Flythe, Michael Shackleford
 Virginia Union University: James Battle, Bernard Franklin, Stacey Jones

Wabash College: Vernon Mummert, David Phillips
 Wartburg College: Gary Grace, Jill Gremmels, Jack Ohle
 Washburn University of Topeka: Larry Blumberg, Janet Degginger,
 Jerry Farley, Loren Ferre
 Washington and Jefferson College: Jeffrey R. Docking, John J. Gregor,
 John L. Luckhardt, Richard H. Soudan
 Washington and Lee University: Cinda Rankin, Michael F. Walsh
 Washington College (Maryland): Bryan Matthews
 Washington State University: Kenneth Casavant
 Washington University (Missouri): John Schael, T. J. Shelton
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Michael J. Barry
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Bob Brennan, Robert L. Carter,
 Christ Petrouleas
 Waynesburg College: Daniel Baranik
 Weber State University: John W. Johnson
 Webster University: Thomas Bart, Richard Meyers
 Wellesley College: Suzanne Walmsley
 Wells College: Lyn LaBar
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: Lee Conrad
 Wesley College: Gale Lackey
 Wesleyan College (Georgia): Peter Smith
 University of West Alabama: Curtis "Dee" Outlaw, Ed Roach, Micky
 Smith
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Barbara Cleghorn, Edward
 Matjekovic, Paul Oliaro
 University of West Florida: Richard Berg, Nichole Keshock, Doug
 Palmer
 State University of West Georgia: Costas U. Douvanis, Tim Hynes
 West Liberty State College: James W. Watson
 West Texas A&M University: Russell Long, Hellon Wilbur
 West Virginia State College: Steven Bryce Casto
 West Virginia University Institute of Technology: Michael Neese,
 Mike Springston
 West Virginia Wesleyan College: George Klebez
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington, James
 Roach
 Western Illinois University: Donald Spencer
 Western Maryland College: Robert H. Chambers, Carol A. Fritz,
 James M. Smith
 Western New England College: Michael Theulen
 Western New Mexico University: Scott Woodard
 Western State College of Colorado: Harry Peterson, Greg Waggoner
 Western Washington University: Lynda Goodrich, Karen Morse
 Westfield State College: Kenneth Magarian
 Westminster College (Pennsylvania): Tammy Swearingen
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Chad Yowell
 Wheeling Jesuit University: John Mansuy

Whittier College: Dave Jacobs, Patricia Van Oosbree
 Whitworth College: Scott McQuilkin
 Wilkes University: Addy Malatesta
 Willamette University: Lee Pelton, Bill Trenbeath
 College of William and Mary: Edward C. Driscoll Jr.
 William Paterson University of New Jersey: Art Eason, Sabrina
 Grant
 William Penn College: Michael Laird
 Williams College: Robert Peck, David L. Smith, Karen Whalen
 Wilmington College (Ohio): Terry Rupert
 Wilson College: Lori Frey
 Wingate University: Bethyna Murray
 Winona State University: Kim Blum
 Winston-Salem State University: Paul Cloud, Anne Little, Lee
 Stackhouse
 Wisconsin Lutheran College: Cheryl Pasbrig
 University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire: Marilyn Skrivseth
 University of Wisconsin, La Crosse: Joe Baker, Jodie Rindt-Wagner
 University of Wisconsin, Madison: Jamie Pollard
 University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh: Allen Ackerman, Burk Tower
 University of Wisconsin, Parkside: John Keating, Lenny Klaver, Bill
 Murin
 University of Wisconsin, Platteville: David Markee, Mark Molesworth
 University of Wisconsin, River Falls: Connie Foster, Barbara Rebhuhn
 University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point: Eugene Johnson, Frank O'Brien
 University of Wisconsin, Stout: Steve Terry, John Wesolek
 University of Wisconsin, Superior: Kristin Falk
 University of Wisconsin, Whitewater: Shawn Eicherst, Jack Miller
 Wittenberg University: Jeff Ankrom, Kathleen M. Schulz
 College of Wooster: Gordon Collins, Stanton Hales, Robert Malekoff,
 Brenda Meese
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond Gilbert
 Worcester State College: Susan Chapman
 Yeshiva University: Richard Zerneck
 York College (New York): Linda Barley, Ronald St. John
 Youngstown State University: Floyd Kerr, Pauline Saternow

Provisional Members

Baptist Bible College (Pennsylvania): James Huckaby
 Bay Path College: Steven J. Smith
 Becker College: Gene Alley
 Benedict College: Gwendolyn Rouse, Willie Washington
 Birmingham Southern College: Leslie Claybrook, Joe Dean Jr.,
 Johnny Johnson, Robert Slagter
 Bloomfield College: Kathy Perri, Sheila Wooten
 Caldwell College: Mark Corino, Dean Johnson, Sister Michel
 Rodgers, Sister Patrice Werner
 Concordia University at Austin: William Driskill, Linda Lowery

Dallas Baptist University: Steve Mullen, Wayne Poage, Trent Wall
 Dominican University (Illinois): Maureen Harty
 D'Youville University: Brian Miller
 East Texas Baptist University: Kent Reeves
 Evergreen State College: Janette Parent
 State University of New York at Farmingdale: Tom Azzara, Walter Schnell, Jolie Ward
 Felician College: Sister Theresa M. Martin, Robert D. Symons, Sister M. Tarcilia
 University of Findlay: Steven Rackley, David Wallach
 Georgian Court College: Mary Cranwell, Debra Emery
 Goldey Beacom College: Joyce Jones, Chris Morgan, Bernadette Wimberley
 Green Mountain College: Thomas Benson, Chris Gilmore, Carol Hartshorn, Candy Rice
 Holy Family College: Sister Patrice Feher, Sandra Michael, Sister Francesca Onley
 Houghton College: Daniel Chamberlain, Harold "Skip" Lord
 Huntingdon College: Todd Schilperoort
 Husson College: Pam Hennessey
 La Grange College: F. Stuart Gulley, Phil Williamson
 Le Tourneau University: Dirk Nelson
 Lesley College: Stanley C. Vieira
 Lipscomb University: Steve Flatt, Kent Johnson, Steve Potts
 University of Mary Hardin-Baylor: Darla Kirby, Ben Shipp
 Medaille College: Richard J. Herdlein
 University of Minnesota, Crookston: Brad Kerr, Vern Markey, Donald Sargeant
 Mount Ida College: Jacqueline A. Palmer
 New York City Technical College: Ray Amalbert, Anisia B. Quinones
 Newbury College: Marybeth Lamb
 North Greenville College: Suzanne Dodd, James "Jimmy" Epting, Jan McDonald
 Northland College: Jim Miller, Steve Wammer
 Northwest Nazarene University: Scott Armstrong
 Nova Southeastern University: Shannon Cain, Mark Cavanaugh, Corey Johnson
 Nyack College: Debra Beck, Keith Davie
 Ohio Valley College: Ron Payan, Robert W. Stephens
 Peace College: Liz Thurston
 Pennsylvania State University, Altoona: Brent Baird, Fredina M. Ingold, Robert N. Pangborn
 Philadelphia College of the Bible: Sherrill Babb, Dick Beach
 University of the Sciences in Philadelphia: Gayle Garrison, Philip P. Gerbino, Paul Klimitas
 University of Pittsburgh, Greensburg: Frank Cassell, Mark McColloch, Daniel Swalg, Julie Tietz
 University of Puerto Rico, Bayamon: Luis R. Reeves, Carmen A. Rivera, Doriscelis Roura, Carmen M. Skerrett

University of Puerto Rico, Cayey: Luis Bonilla, Agustin Flores, Ray J. Quinones
 University of Puerto Rico, Humacao: Enoc Diaz Santana, David Ferrer, Angel N. Velazquez Ortiz
 University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez: Hector B. Figueroa, Marta Mora, Manuel Ramirez, Karen Soto, Zulma Toro, Andres Velazquez
 University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras: David Aleman, George Hillyer, Farah A. Ramirez, Gary Voce
 Roberts Wesleyan College: Michael Faro
 St. Thomas Aquinas College: Dennis O'Donnell, Walter Schneider, Barbara Vano
 Schreiner College: J. Thompson Biggers, Barry Shaw
 Seattle University: Anne Carragher, Stephen V. Sundborg
 Spelman College: Barbara Brown, James Gates, Audrey Manley, Dorothy Richey
 Teikyo Post University: Dan Mara
 University of Texas at Dallas: Kurt Beron, Mary Walters
 Thomas College: David Thombs
 Tiffin University: Ian Day, John J. Millar
 University of Virginia's College at Wise: George Culbertson, Carroll Dale, Wayne Edwards, Gary Juhan, Jay Lemons, Ray Spenilla
 Western Oregon University: Jon R. Carey, Eric J. Cooley, Betty J. Youngblood
 Wilmington College (Delaware): Jack Varsalona

Affiliated Members

Community College League of California: Joanne A. Fortunato
 Intercollegiate Tennis Association: Ann Lebedeff
 Metropolitan Intercollegiate Basketball Association: John J. Powers
 National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Mike Cleary, Pat Manak, Bob Vecchione
 National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators: Jennifer Alley
 National Fastpitch Coaches Association: Lacy Lee Baker
 National Federation of State High School Associations: John Black, Bob Kanaby
 United States Olympic Committee: Curt Hamakawa
 Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes

Corresponding Members

Pratt Institute: Dave Adebajo

Visitors

Good Sports, Inc.: Valerie Bonnette
 Heery International, Inc.: Mike Holleman
 Lee University: Larry Carpenter
 Milling Benson Woodward: Robert L. Clayton
 Moorpark High School: Andi Mallen

Nike: Joan Scott

Pasadena Tournament of Roses: Gary Dorm, Nancy Dorm, Charlotta Triplett, Otis Triplett, Mike Ward

San Jose Sports Authority: Gary Fazzino, Jan Hutchins, Dean Munro
Smith Consulting Services: Dale Smith

Susse Chalet: Don Pyke

The Compliance Group: Chuck Smrt

Total Sports: Richard Stewart

Verrill and Dana, LLP: Janet Justus

94th Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 9, 2000

The 94th annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 3.45 p.m. by Charles Wethington, Jr., NCAA Executive Committee chair and president, University of Kentucky.

OPENING REMARKS

Charles Wethington Jr.: Ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to welcome you to this opening session of the 2000 NCAA Convention. As chair of the NCAA Executive Committee, I have the pleasure of leading this opening session.

The chairs of the other presidential governing bodies are with me on the dais today. Please welcome Graham Spanier, Pennsylvania State University, chair of the Division I Board of Directors; Gladys Styles Johnston, University of Nebraska at Kearney, chair of the Division II Presidents Council; and Ann Die, Hendrix College, chair of the Division III Presidents Council. (Applause) Also on the dais is Cedric Dempsey, NCAA president. Cedric will be introduced later. Our parliamentarian is Alan Chapman and Bridget Belgiovine, assistant chief of staff for Division III.

The Rev Jesse Jackson, an international and political figure for peace, civil rights, gender equality and social justice is unable to be with us due to last-minute schedule changes. Therefore, our session today will not include a keynote address, but it will include the State of the Association address.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

I do want to give you a brief report from the Executive Committee for this past year. I am sure many of you remember, in August 1997 the Association underwent a very significant change in the way we conduct our business. The governance structure is now federated, allowing each division to operate more autonomously and to make more decisions independently of the other divisions. However, it is important for us to remember that we are still an Association of all three divisions and all of the member institutions.

With that in mind, I want to give you a brief report of the activities of the Executive Committee in 1999. The Executive Committee is comprised of chief executive officers from all three divisions and oversees the affairs of the Association as a whole. One of the primary roles of the Executive Committee is to review and approve the Association's budget. Each of the three divisions reviews and

approves its own divisional budget, but the Executive Committee is responsible for approving the Association-wide budget. In 1999, we made a number of revisions to the budgetary process that should make the approval of the Association's budget more efficient and keep it within the principles of the new governance structure.

Another responsibility of the Executive Committee is to monitor litigation in which the Association is involved. I am sure you are well aware that the Association was involved in a number of very significant and high-profile lawsuits in 1999. For instance, the restricted-earnings case, the Smith versus the NCAA case, the most-recent Supreme Court case that ruled the NCAA was not a direct recipient of federal funds relative to Title IX, the baseball bat litigation and the Cureton case involving initial-eligibility standards. That's only a few. As a result, the Executive Committee has spent a great deal of its time this past year reviewing legal issues.

The Executive Committee receives regular reports on the status of all of the lawsuits and legal affairs of the Association, providing guidance and making decisions related to litigation when necessary. These issues are often complicated to understand and challenging to resolve. However, the Executive Committee is committed to handling them in a way that we believe best serves the interest of the membership and the Association as a whole.

Two years ago, the Executive Committee reestablished a presidential ad hoc committee to oversee gender and ethnicity issues of the Association. This past fall, this Committee received a status report from its ad hoc committee related to the Association's gender and ethnicity audit and sent the recommendation to the division governance structure for consideration. Recognizing the Association's commitment to gender and diversity, the Executive Committee established a standing presidential subcommittee on ethnicity and gender charged with monitoring progress in these areas.

Another responsibility of the Executive Committee is to provide strategic planning for the Association. On October 28, the Executive Committee engaged in its first strategic-planning retreat. The session included discussions in three major areas: the role and expectations of the Executive Committee; the role of the NCAA president and staff and the governance structure; and the identification of major priorities for the Association as we embark on a new millennium.

As you may recall, the primary purposes for restructuring the NCAA several years ago were to provide greater clarity of authority as to where and how the decisions are made within the Association and to create a structure whereby the chief executive officers have primary responsibility for governing the Association. The Executive Committee affirmed its commitment to exercise its judicious and legislative leadership in addition to a leadership role in determining and advancing the Association's wide initiatives on behalf of the membership. The chief executive officers throughout the governance structure have been unequivocal in their insistence on active leader-

ship of the NCAA presidents and the senior staff of the NCAA. In this regard, the Executive Committee expects the NCAA president to be proactive, anticipate issues and challenges and present recommendations that take advantage of senior staff members' experience and enhances the efficiency and the clarity of decision-making and increases the accountability within the Association.

Finally, the Executive Committee identified four priorities for the Association. These priorities support the overall commitment of the NCAA to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational process, while supporting a comprehensive approach to building student-athletes as leaders across the nation. The priorities will be articulated by President Dempsey in his state of the Association remarks later in the program. The Executive Committee challenges the governance structure to support the Association's priority in its work on behalf of the membership and our thousands of student-athletes.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, one item of business that we traditionally conduct during this session is to hear the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I ask the delegates, visitors and our friends in the news media to remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions. May I present Charles Welford, athletics representative, University of Maryland, College Park.

REPORT OF THE MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Charles Welford (University of Maryland, College Park): Mr. Chairman and delegates, at this time I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. With me on the podium are Lawrence Fitzgerald, Southern Connecticut State University, and Mary Jo Gunning, Marywood University. Unable to be here today is Charlene Johnson, South Carolina State University.

The following is a list of those men and women who have passed away since we last met. First will be the names of the administrators and coaches.

Administrators:

"Sonny" Allen, Morehead State
Nina Amundson, California Lutheran
"Forddy" Anderson, Bradley
John Ball, Truman
Charles Bertram, Southern Indiana
Bob Blitz, C. W. Post
Thomas Botts, Missouri
Charles Branum, South Alabama
Robert Brooker, Indianapolis
Ricky Byrdsong, Northwestern
Stephen Cannon, Fort Lewis
"Big Daddy" Carson, Jackson State
Ernest Casal, Temple
"Bull" Cavanaugh, Arizona
Phil Cutchin, Oklahoma State

Johnny Dee, Notre Dame
 Edward Donnelly, Vermont
 Peter Downey, Sacred Heart
 John Dorish, Kings College
 Robert Faris, George Washington
 William Fenton, Iowa
 Brian Fishman, Michigan
 Eldon Fix, Lewis and Clark
 "Bud" Francis, Charleston
 Paul Gregory, Mississippi State
 Matt Hartl, Northwestern
 William Healey, Northern Illinois
 Matthew Heldman, Illinois
 Bryant Houston, Edinboro
 Robert Hulton, Gettysburg
 Hank Johns, College of New Jersey
 Alva Kelly, Jr., Hobart
 "Rick" Lappert, Akron
 "Sig" Lawson, Austin College
 Alvin Lee, Alabama
 Steve Little, Arkansas
 Donald Loucks, Florida State
 Paul McBrayer, Eastern Kentucky
 Michael Malone, Montana State University
 Robert Mason, Austin College
 William McCurdy, Harvard
 Johnny McLendon, Tennessee State
 Ryland Milner, Northwest Missouri State
 James Myers, West Virginia Wesleyan
 Primo Nebiolo, IAAF
 John O'Connor, VMI
 Frank Partel, Stevens Institute
 Stennet Pierce, University of Wisconsin, Stout
 Daniel Quilty, New York University
 Mary Rice, Rowan
 William Reading, University of Maryland, College Park
 Brian Reed, Ferrum
 Donald Riddle, University of Illinois, Chicago
 "Red" Romo, Navy
 Joseph Sabol, Norwich
 Jimmy Sidle, Auburn
 Charlie Skinner, Alma
 Walter Slovinski, Bates
 Eddie Stanky, South Alabama
 Paul Stuart, Nevada
 Jeremy Streck, Kentucky
 Edwin Thompson, Delaware
 Roy Van Ness, College of New Jersey

"Pony" Wilson, Rutgers-Camden
 Robert Woll, Monmouth

The following are names of student-athletes:

Brandon Bulsworth, Arkansas
 Clayton Corder, Hardin-Simmons
 Lucie Hanusova, Colorado
 Angela Proctor, Texas-Pan American
 James Quinn, Rhode Island College
 Paul Reyna, Boise State
 Jacori Rufus, Idaho State
 Natasha Sachiko, California-Santa Cruz
 Chris Severy, Colorado, Colorado Springs
 Eric Sopracasa, Massachusetts-Amherst
 Shannon Stewart, Bluefield State
 Matthew Weiner, Princeton

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us. Thank you.

If you know of persons who should be added to these lists, please contact a member of the committee or the national office staff. Thank you very much.

Mr. Wethington: Thank you, Dr. Welford, and thank you, members of that committee.

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

Now I would like to introduce our president, who will give the State of the Association address. Before I ask Ced to come up, I would like to say a couple of things about our president. First, let me tell you that during this last year I believe that Cedric Dempsey has provided exceptional leadership for this Association. As all of you know, during this last year, the move was made to a new headquarters in Indianapolis, a move that took a lot of time, effort, work and leadership. In my opinion, it has been carried out most successfully. I think all of you are also well aware of the leadership that Cedric Dempsey and the staff provided during the recent television negotiations that has led us to an excellent television contract for the men's basketball tournament, which will help ensure the financial well being of this Association and its member institutions in the years ahead.

During all of this and during the time I have worked with Ced Dempsey, I can tell you that he constantly keeps the welfare of the student-athlete at the top of his agenda. That's one of the things that I appreciate about him and one of the things I know that you expect from the leadership of this Association.

It is a real pleasure for me, ladies and gentlemen, to present to you Cedric Dempsey for the State of the Association address. Ced. (Applause)

Cedric Dempsey, NCAA President: Thank you, President Wethington. Good afternoon.

For those people standing in the room, there are still a lot of

empty seats over here. You may not have read the fine print today, but everybody who is seated, their institution will receive an extra \$1,000 in revenue distribution. You may want to consider some of these seats over here. (Laughter)

I would like to dispel one rumor before I begin my remarks today. A number of people asked me as I was coming in: "Are you going to take your time and Reverend Jackson's time as well?" meaning an hour and one-half that was allotted. I assured them that that was not true. First of all, my voice wouldn't last that long. Secondly, I don't have that much to say.

I hope you will bear with me for some comments that I feel very strongly about. I hope that they will possibly test your interest and set the stage for the remainder of this Convention.

In these State of the Association addresses over the past few years, I've tried to remind all of us of our history and the principles upon which this organization was founded and by which it has prospered for nearly 100 years. I believe those principles are alive and well today, but I also believe they will be constantly tested as we confront new pressures, new distractions and new opportunities moving into our next century.

We would be hard-pressed to find a year in the history of the Association with more distractions and opportunities than the one we have just completed. There have been many significant moments in the past, certainly. But 1999 has been a watershed year.

As President Wethington has already indicated, we started the year with the controversy over specifications for baseball bats, then received and appealed a decision in the Cureton case, settled the restricted-earnings case, moved the national office 500 miles to Indianapolis and replaced two-thirds of our staff; brought closure to the bat specifications; and negotiated a media and marketing rights package with CBS for a minimum of \$6 billion over 11 years. And just days before Christmas, we received word that we were successful with our appeal in the Cureton case. That—by any standard—is a full agenda for this Association, or for any Association.

I'll touch more on some of those events in a moment. But there was another significant event in 1999 that drew very little attention. In October, the NCAA Executive Committee set four broad goals that define this Association's charge through the remainder of its first 100 years and prepare us for our second century.

The four goals are to:

- Promote student-athletes and college sports through public awareness;
- Protect student-athletes through standards of fairness and integrity;
- Prepare student-athletes for lifetime leadership; and
- Provide student-athletes and college sports with the funding to help meet those goals.

Promote, protect, prepare, provide. They will drive our mission for what I believe in and have a personal commitment to—nothing less than the total development of the student-athlete.

The first goal calls for the Association to inform constituents on campus, in the media and in the general public about the lifelong values of athletics in the educational environment.

How are we going to do that? This month, we will begin implementation of a coordinated public affairs plan that focuses on the positive contributions of student-athletes and college sports in higher education. We will do that by establishing an integrated NCAA communications network to involve campus and conference leaders at the local level to tell the NCAA story and the story of college sports.

We'll build stronger relationships with coaches and administrators—those most influential in shaping the attitudes and lives of student-athletes. And we will begin a campaign to go directly to the public with important messages about the NCAA, college sports and higher education.

That is a quick overview of the plan, the details of which you will hear more about in the near future. It sounds simple, but I assure you the plan will test our ability to interrelate the national office with the campuses and the conferences. It will test us to stay on task, and to change where our practices don't fulfill our mission. We need your full support to achieve this goal.

The Executive Committee's second goal calls on the NCAA to reinforce the values of fairness and integrity in intercollegiate athletics. While our role as an Association is to implement the rules by which members agree to abide, our goal is that institutions and individuals will assume greater responsibility for their own actions.

Let me give you an example: In the last five years, the number of self-reported cases of secondary violations has increased by nearly 81 percent to slightly more than 1,600 in 1998 alone. This supports my contention that, as a group, we are doing a better job of monitoring our programs and taking responsibility for compliance.

Another key point on the integrity agenda has been sports wagering. Through an aggressive educational effort and as a result of a few high profile point-shaving cases, we've increased the awareness of this critical concern. But because sports wagering is legal in some places, we continue to battle a society-wide perception that betting on college sports is okay. It definitely is not okay.

I want to introduce a new initiative to address this problem. The Executive Committee—and we will ask each of you to become involved as well—fully supports proposed federal legislation that will ban all wagering on college sports. This will include those opportunities that today are legal. This will be an uphill battle. The opposition is well financed and determined. But this is the right position for us to take. As a nation, we cannot sanction betting on college students.

It's generally accepted that in recent years sportsmanship and ethical behavior have suffered serious deterioration. We cannot give those values away to the bad attitude and offensive behavior we often see in society. Athletics must lead. We must develop and implement strategies that foster greater acceptance of the values of respect, fairness, civility, honesty, caring and responsibility among student-athletes, coaches, officials, fans and related groups.

The third goal is one by which this Association and intercollegiate athletics will be most critically judged. The Executive Committee has mandated that the NCAA prepare student-athletes for lifetime leadership in a dynamic and diverse society.

When we say in our mission that we must maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of higher education, we are talking about academic standards. It is fundamental for higher education to maintain the connection between classroom performance and athletics participation, and we must increase graduation rates for student-athletes. Those rates—especially in football and basketball—are not high enough. We must do a better job of fulfilling our academic responsibility.

In this new year, I'll recommend that we continue to look at ways to strengthen the continuing-eligibility requirements to better ensure academic success of student-athletes. But frankly, institutions must then discipline themselves to recruit for more than just the freshman year and to only admit students who are committed and can stay the course.

As one high-profile football coach recently noted, "If a prospect doesn't fit the standard deviation of your student body, it's going to be very difficult for that athlete to successfully perform schoolwork." He went on to say, "You can't sign players who only have a 20, 30 or 40 percent chance of graduating from your university."

I also recommend that we create other incentives for institutions to identify and recruit only those student-athletes with significant likelihood of success. In Division I, the Basketball Issues Working Group has developed a proposal that will reward programs that are successful in graduating basketball players with additional grants-in-aid. I fully support that concept.

The second component in this goal deals with deregulation. For all of us, change is often difficult to embrace. Nowhere has that been more apparent than with deregulation of the NCAA Manual. Despite an almost universally accepted complaint that there are too many rules, and numerous attempts at various times to reduce those rules, we haven't made much progress. Inevitably, we lose sight of the deregulation target in favor of concerns about the level playing field, budgets and other provincial interests.

Well, we have a new opportunity to deregulate and help student-athletes through a discussion emerging in all three divisions regarding amateurism. Based on nearly 300 reinstatement requests from you in the last two years, it is clear that we are not yet of one mind on how to apply a consistent standard. I believe it is time to redefine many of those rules. We can accomplish this without sacrificing our principle of amateurism.

The application of our current rules has resulted in inconsistent consequences for various amateurism violations. Here is the undeniable truth: Some high-school prospects have lost all or a significant amount of their collegiate eligibility for violations where no competi-

tive advantage was gained, while other prospects who participated in extensive organized competition and gained significant competitive advantages were able to enjoy four seasons of collegiate competition. That shouldn't happen.

We have the first set of proposals—involving the pre-enrolled prospect—before you in Division I. Tomorrow, you will have a chance to discuss those in the Division I forum. I encourage you to enter this discussion with an open mind, and I strongly encourage the Division I Management Council to forward these proposals to the membership in April.

The third component of our commitment to student-athletes as leaders is our responsibility to deepen their appreciation for the advantages of a diverse society and to provide opportunities for responsible citizenship.

To that end, we should consider requiring attendance of student-athletes, coaches and administrators at diversity education programs as part of Division I certification and for self-study programs in Divisions II and III.

We also must increase our attention to hiring for diversity. When we moved our national headquarters to Indianapolis, we dramatically changed our diversity makeup. That was my personal goal. Today, female representation on our administrative staff is 47 percent and our minority representation is nearly 22 percent.

I am proud of that model for the national office, but the track record for building equally diverse staff at member institutions—especially at the level of head coach and athletics management—simply is not good enough.

There is a price to be paid if we don't change the status quo. We continue to hire white men almost exclusively in top coaching and administrative positions. That makeup does not reflect the ethnic and gender makeup of our student-athletes population or society in general.

The consequences of continuing down this current path could likely be expensive in many ways. Your commitment to reflecting societal diversity in your hiring practices is the only thing that will make a difference. It must be real, it must be personal, and it must be deep.

The fourth component is to fulfill our purpose of making student-athletes an integral part of the student body and developing them into leaders. We have to remove those regulations that impede the student-athletes' integration into campus life.

We must review the playing and practice season legislation to decrease the athletics time-burden on student-athletes and increase the time and support to help them reach their academic goals. We have a 20-hour rule that should ensure balance. But in developing the public affairs plan, we asked a focus group of recently graduated student-athletes about the 20-hour rule. Their reaction was that it's a joke. That troubles me.

We've compromised student-athletes' time away from their sport with so-called "volunteer" athletics participation. There are even some in college athletics who would eliminate the 20-hour rule altogether. We cannot allow that to happen. In fact, we have to review the exceptions to that rule and get the balance back to where it should be.

Now, let's go to the mission-critical issue of modeling good leadership behavior.

We need to address this issue on two fronts. Our primary concern is how we as leaders model behavior for those who participate in college sports. To that end, I want the Association—in conjunction with conferences and campuses—to develop leadership workshops for coaches and administrators.

Second, we need to increase access for more student-athletes to the NCAA Foundation Leadership Conference so that we have more participants taking the lessons learned back to their campuses.

The Executive Committee's fourth goal addresses the need for sound fiscal management of the Association's resources. In terms of mission, this goal is more important than ever as the cost continues to rise for providing quality athletics, academic and citizenship opportunities—in other words, the total development of the student-athlete.

In Divisions I and II, we are spending \$829 million annually on athletic-related financial aid alone. And as a group, the 973 colleges and universities that are members of this Association are spending \$3.4 billion each year on college sports. That is a difficult burden for schools to carry. It is no wonder then, that fewer than 80 schools in the entire membership are operating their athletics programs in the black.

Among our negotiating goals in the new rights agreement with CBS was to increase revenue distributions to member institutions for the direct support of participation opportunities. The Executive Committee will begin considering a process for allocating the dollars from this new agreement at this Convention. Our timeline anticipates a decision by October of this year, which should provide plenty of time—and opportunities—for input and discussion by the membership. I'll be recommending substantial increases in distribution to our members and in student-athlete assistance programs.

Our initial fiscal challenge—and it will be taken up by the Executive Committee this week—will be to determine how the \$40 million in up-front money that we have already received will be distributed.

The budget subcommittee will recommend a plan to the Executive Committee on Tuesday for distribution of that up-front payment—a recommendation that I fully support. Thirty million dollars would be distributed to Division I schools based on our current formula, \$3 million, based on legislative requirements, would go to Divisions II and III as a one-time payment, and the remaining \$7 mil-

lion would go toward rebuilding the Association's reserves.

I'll also recommend that the distribution to our Division I members increase at a minimum of 23 percent in 2003—the first year of the new agreement—with annual increases of no less than 8.5 percent. Divisions II and III will also see an increase of 20 percent in the first year followed by approximately 8 percent each year thereafter.

Another of our negotiating goals was to increase the dollars earmarked specifically for student-athletes. I said at the time of the announcement and I want to reiterate that today—student-athletes must be among the first beneficiaries of this new rights agreement.

I believe the student-athlete assistance fund and the academic enhancement fund provide the two best avenues to enhance student-athlete needs. The student-athlete assistance fund is designed to give money directly to student-athletes for clothing, educational expenses and other special needs. Under the current distribution formula, those two funds will distribute more than \$250 million, over a 10-year period, directly to student-athletes. That is a significant amount.

But, I'll recommend that the special assistance fund be increased from the \$10 million annually to \$25 million in the first year of the new agreement, with inflationary increases of at least 8 percent over the life of the contract.

Increases in this effort coupled with the academic enhancement program already funded at \$15 million annually will provide more than three-quarters of a billion dollars over the life of the agreement to the direct support of student-athletes.

And I will also propose greater access to these funds and greater flexibility in how they can be spent so more student-athletes can benefit in more ways. This means that while our revenue stream from rights fees is more than doubling, our direct-dollar commitment to student-athletes is tripling under the new agreement.

Over the term of the new contract, these recommendations—along with increases for NCAA championships—will return a minimum of \$5.2 billion to member schools, student-athletes and championships. At the same time, they will decrease the percentage of support to the administrative functions of this Association—a specific goal of the Executive Committee.

But as significant as the \$6 billion agreement is, it will not solve all the financial concerns of athletics programs. And we must continue to fully explore opportunities to diversify revenue sources of the Association.

As you can see, we have an ambitious agenda. But this is the right moment—indeed a unique moment—and we have the financial stability to seize this opportunity. The only question may be our commitment.

So in closing, I hope you will ask yourself this question frequently in this new year, this new century, and this new millennium.

If we aren't here to take advantage of this moment—this new

beginning—to rededicate ourselves to our mission; if we aren't here to model and fulfill the values of education, athletics, diversity, respect and citizenship; if we aren't here to recommit ourselves to building leaders on the team, in the classroom, in the community and in society—the total development of the student-athlete; and if we aren't here for those things, then, for goodness sakes, why are we here?

I believe that is why we are here. I also believe in each of you, and I look forward to working with you on this ambitious plan as we enter a second century of commitment to our members, all those who follow college sports and—most importantly—our student-athletes. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Wethington: Thank you, Ced. I think you have done a very fine job in challenging this Association and its member institutions to do right as we move into this next millennium.

ASSOCIATION-WIDE LEGISLATION

Mr. Wethington: It is necessary to call this assembly to order for a brief Association business session to consider Proposal No. 1—The Principle of Nondiscrimination—which can be found on Page 1 of your Official Notice of this meeting.

Please note that voting delegates will need their voting paddles. Assisting me on the dais is Alan Chapman, parliamentarian, and Bridget Belgiovini, the liaison to the Executive Committee. For those of you who have not participated in one of these sessions for some time, I will start by recognizing a delegate to make a motion to adopt the proposal. Then we will ask for a second. The presenter may offer comments concerning the proposal. Additional delegates who wish to speak should take a position at the microphones and be recognized by the chair. Each speaker should state his or her name and affiliation for the record when recognized by the chair. When there are no further speakers, the chair will request the vote of the delegates present by a showing of paddles. Please note that the bylaws require a separate vote to approve an immediate effective date, rather than an August 1, 2000, date, through a paddle vote and then proceed to vote on the overall proposal. Each vote will require a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting for passage. We are now ready to consider Proposal No. 1.

The Principle of Nondiscrimination

Thomas Courtice (Ohio Wesleyan University): I hereby move the adoption of Proposal No. 1.

[The motion was seconded]

The adoption of this proposal would make the nondiscrimination language in the NCAA Constitution more specific by adding language to indicate the Association refrains from discriminating on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, creed or sexual orientation with respect to our policies, programs and activities.

The proposal also specifies that it is the responsibility of each member institution to determine independently its own policies regarding nondiscrimination. This proposal was recommended by the Committee on Women's Athletics, developed with assistance from the NCAA's legal counsel and it is sponsored by the Executive Committee.

Support the Association's commitment to promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person. The Executive Committee urges support and approval of this proposal.

Cheryl L. Levick (Stanford University): I rise to support Proposal No. 1. As chair of the Committee on Women's Athletics and on behalf of the committee, it is imperative that the Association respect diversity of all its members. It therefore is taking this leadership role by strengthening its nondiscrimination policies.

In short, this policy commits the Association to be inclusive of all its members, yet still supports the ability for the member institutions to make their own campus decision. It is the right thing to do. I urge your support of this proposal.

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): On behalf of the Division II Management Council and as a member of the Executive Committee, I urge you to vote for Proposal No. 1.

The Association consists of over 1,000 diverse colleges and universities. None of its members should be excluded from Association-wide programs and activities. This language will support the Association's commitment to nondiscrimination and to inclusiveness. I urge your support of this nondiscrimination proposal.

Mr. Wethington: Are there any other speakers?

We will vote on Proposal No. 1 to put it into effect immediately; otherwise, it will go into effect August 1, 2000. A two-thirds majority is required for passage. The defeat of this effective date would preclude the start date to August 1, 2000.

[The immediate effective date of Proposal No. 1 (Page A-2) was adopted.]

We will now vote on Proposal No. 1. That is the motion itself that Tom introduced. It now has an immediate effective date if you decide to pass it. A two-thirds majority is required for passage of this motion.

[Proposal No. 1 (Page A-2) was adopted.]

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Please don't forget that we have our honors dinner at 7:30 tonight.

Unless there is a motion to reconsider Proposal No. 1, this concludes the business of the day. We are adjourned.

[The opening business session was adjourned at 4.45 p.m.]

NCAA Honors Dinner

Sunday Evening, January 9, 2000

WELCOME

Charles Wethington (NCAA Executive Committee Chair/ University of Kentucky): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It is a pleasure to welcome you to our 35th annual NCAA honors dinner. Please stand, and I will present to you Amy Huchthausen, a member of the NCAA Student-Advisory Committee, the Division III Management Council and former softball student-athlete from the University of Wisconsin, Lacrosse. After the invocation, please enjoy your dinner. Then we will be back with tonight's program.

Miss Amy Huchthausen.

INVOCATION

Amy Huchthausen (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Thank you. Let us give thanks for bringing us together this evening to honor and celebrate the accomplishments of these remarkable individuals. We ask that we be blessed tonight, as we serve witness to what can be attained when we fully utilize the talents that we have so graciously been given.

We give thanks for the level of character that has been bestowed upon tonight's honorees. The integrity they have displayed throughout their lives has provided us with examples we are proud to emulate. Please bless us for all that we are about to receive and all who we are here to honor.

Mr. Wethington: Please be seated.

Dinner was served.

OPENING PRESENTATION

(Audiovisual Recording): It's the dawn of a new century, but the characteristics that make college sports unique remain intact. Tonight, we will recognize the accomplishments of a group of current and former student-athletes who are the paradigms of sportsmanship—both on and off the playing fields. They are leaders not only in sports, but also in the classroom and the world at large.

Tonight's honorees include student-athletes from colleges large and small; from the United States and from foreign lands. They are college coaches; military heroes; and some have taken the athletics gifts they first showcased on the collegiate stage and risen to the highest levels of their respective sports. Welcome to the NCAA honors dinner.

Mr. Wethington: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, we have a wonderful program this evening, so let's get started with our celebration. If you have had an opportunity to look over tonight's pro-

gram, you no doubt like me are impressed with our honorees.

These individuals truly have made outstanding contributions in intercollegiate athletics—whether it was during the last four years or 25 years ago.

Once you have been introduced to them and hear more about their accomplishments, you will come to see a very common bond that they all share. Not only were they top-caliber student-athletes, but they also gave—and continue to give—generously of their time and talents toward making their institutions, their communities and even their countries better places in which to live, to work and to play.

Our Top VIII honorees have excelled in team sports and individual sports. Interestingly, one of them is an Olympian, two have led their teams to NCAA national championships, one is a two-sport athlete, and four others are outstanding individuals from the sports of football, basketball, baseball and field hockey. But above all, they have excelled as students and truly have represented their institutions with grace and dignity.

Our Silver Anniversary winners and the Theodore Roosevelt Award winner are absolutely amazing. As college student-athletes, they competed at the highest levels. As adults, they have chosen to pursue professions that allow them to make differences in the lives of young people throughout this country and throughout the world. In addition, they have used their talents granted to them to further promote the advantage of gaining a college education and remaining physically fit and active.

Before we begin, I would like to recognize two people on the dais this evening. First is the chair of the NCAA Honors Committee, which is responsible for selecting tonight's honorees and for planning our program. The chair of that committee and associate commissioner of the Atlantic 10 Conference is Robert Steitz. Bob, will you please stand and let us express our appreciation to you? (Applause)

Also on the dais with us is someone who plays a very key role, not only in this Convention but in the NCAA. He has been a remarkable leader in athletics for many years. Please welcome the president of the NCAA, Cedric Dempsey. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Tonight's master of ceremonies is one of ESPN's Sportscenter's coanchors. Bob Ley, a 1976 magna cum laude graduate of Seton Hall University, began his broadcasting career as the production manager at WOR-AM in New York. He joined ESPN on the network's third day of existence in September 1979, and is currently a coanchor of the 6 p.m. weeknight Sportscenter. He also serves as host of ESPN's "Outside the Lines" series, which focuses on sports issues beyond the competition arena. This program, which in April will become a weekly Sunday morning show, has captured seven sports Emmy awards for sports journalism and three CableAce awards for a sports information series.

In an age when the line between athletics and entertainment is becoming increasingly blurred, Bob Ley is one of the few remaining journalists in sports television. In 20 years at ESPN, he has traveled the world on assignment, much of it for the "Outside the Lines" series. Ley also serves as an anchor on Sportscenter, heading up the coverage of breaking news. His play-by-play reporting has a global tilt, as he was the lead announcer on coverage of the 1998 World Cup. Perhaps his finest work has been reserved for two televised "Town Meetings," including a discussion of race in sports that featured President Clinton on the panel of experts.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to introduce tonight's emcee, Bob Ley. (Applause)

TODAY'S TOP VIII AWARDS

Bob Ley (ESPN): Thank you, Charles, very much. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my great pleasure to be here this evening to help you celebrate the accomplishments of an incredibly prestigious group of student-athletes, both past and present.

Tonight's program permits the NCAA to honor eight outstanding student-athletes from 1999 and six former letter-winners who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

I take tonight great pleasure in introducing to you the NCAA Today's Top VIII award winners. Let's begin

Michael "Hunter" Bledsoe, Vanderbilt University.

Michael excelled on both the baseball diamond and through his community relations efforts. He is a 1999 signee of the Los Angeles Dodgers and was named the Southeastern Conference player of the year in 1999. In addition, he devoted time to working with ill children and their families and to tutoring elementary school children as well.

They call Michael Bledsoe "Hunter." His prey? Southeastern Conference pitchers. Last season, Bledsoe led the SEC in two offensive categories and ranked in the top five in three more. He was a first-team all-America selection. Bledsoe is an all-round player who can hit for contact and power. Apparently, he can run for power as well.

As a senior at Vanderbilt last season, Bledsoe won the SEC batting title with a .459 average and also cracked 10 home runs in his 54 games. But Bledsoe's career wasn't just a walk around the bases. As a freshman at Duke University, he batted just .267 before getting cut from the team. After one year at a junior college, Bledsoe moved on to Vanderbilt where he set the school record for career batting average with a .425 mark. His grade-point average wasn't far behind, as he graduated with a 3.59 in his double major—engineering science and economics. His hard work as a Commodore paid off last spring when he signed a professional contract with the Los Angeles Dodgers.

He is receiving his Top VIII award from Todd Turner, director of

athletics, Vanderbilt University. Ladies and gentlemen, "Hunter" Bledsoe. (Applause)

Brian D. Moorman, Pittsburg State University.

Moorman is a standout athlete in not only one but two sports—football and outdoor track and field. He is a standout in the classroom as well. He earned a perfect 4.0 grade-point average seven times in his college career, finishing with a 3.93 GPA.

Stop the presses. Brian Moorman's collegiate days at Pittsburg State University were filled with all kinds of headline-worthy accomplishments. In the classroom, Moorman was a six-time first-team academic all-American. He earned a perfect 4.0 grade-point average in seven different semesters and finished with a 3.93 GPA overall in history. When Moorman wasn't using his head, he was using his legs, either in football or track and field.

On the gridiron, Moorman was the Pittsburg State punter for four seasons, earning all-American honors each year. He ranked in the top five nationally in yards-per-punt during his sophomore, junior and senior campaigns. Moorman also handled kickoff duties for the Gorillas, constantly pinning the opposition deep in its own territory. When his powerful right foot wasn't kicking footballs, it was clearing hurdles. Moorman was a three-time Division II national champion in the 400-meter hurdles, and he was named the 1999 Division II track and field athlete of the year. (Applause)

He is receiving his Top VIII award from Russ Jewett, the head track and field and cross country coach at Pittsburg State University. Ladies and gentlemen, Brian Moorman. (Applause)

Stephanie Nickitas, University of Florida.

One of the most dominant tennis players in the country for four years, Stephanie has excelled in both singles and doubles tennis, including a career-high ranking in the International Tennis Association as No. 1 in doubles and 13th in singles.

Stephanie Nickitas was the dominant women's collegiate tennis player of the 1990s. During her career at the University of Florida, Nickitas earned four college grand slam titles and six all-America honors. Patience was her virtue. Like a Gator stalking its prey, Nickitas would lie in wait before stealthily sneaking up for the kill. Nickitas collected three collegiate indoor championships and two NCAA outdoor titles.

Over the course of her singles career, Nickitas won 128 matches against just 22 losses. Nickitas knew how to double her pleasure, as she was even more impressive as a team player. Nickitas and partner, Dawn Buth, became the first doubles team in history to repeat as Division I champions, winning in 1996 and again in '97. Nickitas attacked the books as aggressively as she did the net, twice earning academic all-America honors, finishing with a 3.7 GPA in business administration. (Applause)

She is receiving her Top VIII award from Jamie McCloskey, associate athletics director, University of Florida. Ladies and gentlemen,

Stephanie Nickitas. (Applause)

Sally Northcroft, Ball State University.

Sally is a powerful force on the playing field, in the classroom and in her community service efforts. She broke numerous records in field hockey, including setting the Division I field hockey single-season scoring record with 52 goals this past season. Recently, she received the Honda award for the sport of field hockey, and she was a three-time national academic team member with a 3.57 GPA in physical education.

Sally Northcroft has come out of Africa and into the field hockey record books. A native of Zimbabwe, Northcroft dreamed of playing in the states since age 14. Four years ago, only one school in the country offered her a scholarship, but now every college in the country wishes they had. During her career at Ball State University, Northcroft became one of the most potent offensive weapons in women's field hockey history. Northcroft was a two-time all-American and was twice named the Mid-American Conference player of the year. She scored hat tricks 20 different times, and once scored seven goals in a single game.

Northcroft was a clutch performer, scoring nine game-winning goals last season alone. Northcroft capped her remarkable career by breaking the single-season NCAA goal-scoring record against rival Louisville, eclipsing an eight-year-old mark. She finished the season with 52, and will graduate this spring with a degree in physical education. (Applause)

She will receive her Top VIII award from Andrea Seger, athletics director, Ball State University. Ladies and gentlemen, Sally Northcroft. (Applause)

Chad Pennington, Marshall University.

Chad won many awards during his outstanding college football career, including being chosen as one of the nation's top senior football players privileged to play in the Hula Bowl. This Rhodes scholar nominee with a 3.8 GPA in broadcast journalism also excels in the public speaking arena. He gives talks at numerous hospitals, schools and youth sports organizations.

Coming out of high school, Chad Pennington was deemed too small and too weak to play major college football. When Marshall, then a Division I-AA school, gave him his only scholarship offer, Pennington jumped at the opportunity. He made an immediate impact, leading the Thundering Herd to the I-AA national title game.

One year later, Pennington red-shirted when a transfer quarterback became the starter. Pennington upped his efforts in the weight room, and the man who emerged from that season on the sidelines became perhaps the finest quarterback in college football the last three years.

As a red-shirt sophomore in 1997, Pennington threw 39 touchdown passes. One year later, Pennington was an honorable mention all-American at the Division I level. This past season, he ranked sec-

ond in the nation in passing efficiency and was a finalist for the Heisman Trophy.

It should come as no surprise that Pennington is the son of two teachers, for he devotes much of his time to mentoring youngsters. Pennington practices what he preaches, graduating with a 3.8 GPA in broadcast journalism.

Receiving his Top VIII award from Lance West, athletics director, Marshall University, ladies and gentlemen, Chad Pennington. (Applause)

Michael Ruffin, University of Tulsa.

Michael was exceptional in a variety of ways during his college career. In basketball, he led his university to three NCAA tournament bids. In academics, he earned a 3.72 GPA in chemical engineering. And as a volunteer in his community, he tutored both fellow college and high-school students and worked with mentally and physically challenged individuals. (Applause)

Michael Ruffin is an avid collector of exotic animals. And like his furry friends, Ruffin is known to run wild at times. During his four-year career at Tulsa University, Ruffin led the Golden Hurricane to a combined 88 and 40 record. Much more than just a dunking machine, Ruffin was a polished inside player. He became the first player in school history to reach the 1,000 mark in both points and rebounds.

He was a two-time all-Western Athletic Conference selection and last season he finished in the top 20 nationally in both rebounding and blocked shots. Ruffin steered the Hurricane to first-round victories in both the 1997 and 1999 NCAA tournaments. When Ruffin's career ended and his jersey was sent to the rafters, he was Tulsa's all-time leader in rebounding. And he hit the books as hard as he hit the boards. He graduated last year with a 3.72 grade-point average in chemical engineering. (Applause)

Receiving his Top VIII award from Judy MacLeod, athletics director, University of Tulsa, ladies and gentlemen, Michael Ruffin. (Applause)

Kelly Schade, Simpson College.

A three-time most valuable player in the Iowa Conference, Kelly ruled the softball diamond. In one year, she pitched more than 64 consecutive scoreless innings, the third longest such streak in Division III history, and she also became the fourth pitcher in Division III history to reach 700 career strikeouts. She was outstanding in the classroom as well, earning a 3.94 GPA in economics. (Applause)

Spell Kelly Schade's first name with 1,121 "Ks". That's how many strikeouts Schade amassed during her career at Simpson College. A three-time all-American, Schade once went 64 consecutive innings without allowing an earned run. She set six different Division III records, establishing new single-season and career marks in strikeouts, shutouts and wins. And Schade did much more than just garner individual attention. She led the Storm to two NCAA championships.

Once Kelly got warmed up, hitters had a hard time finding "shade" to escape from her heat. Schade once struck out 18 batters in a single game, and during her sophomore season, she posted a minuscule 0.37 earned run average. If hitters simply made contact, they judged it an overwhelming success. For that was the most they could hope for. Schade was a champion on and off the field, posting a 3.94 grade-point average in economics. (Applause)

Receiving her Top VIII award from Bruce Sloan, faculty athletics representative of Simpson College, ladies and gentlemen, Kelly Schade. (Applause)

Debbie Ferguson, University of Georgia.

Our only Olympic athlete of the evening, Debbie was a silver medalist in the 1996 Olympics in the 400-meter relay. The University of Georgia presidential scholar also won awards for her community service and leadership, volunteering for such worthy programs as a homeless shelter and an adopt-a-highway effort.

Debbie Ferguson says she is still perfecting her running style. One can only imagine what will happen when she does perfect it, for Ferguson already ranks among the fastest women on the planet.

A native of the Bahamas, Ferguson helped sprint her country to a silver medal in the 4-by-100 meter relay at the 1996 Atlanta Olympics. After missing the entire 1997 season with an injury, Ferguson returned to competition in 1998, racing for the University of Georgia.

The injury didn't slow her down, as she went on to dominate collegiate sprints for two years. A 19-time all-American, Ferguson earned four NCAA titles for the Bulldogs, including the 1998 100-meter and the 200-meter outdoor championships. She then took her show indoors, winning the 60-meter and 200-meter NCAA crowns.

For her efforts, Ferguson was honored with the 1999 Jackie Joyner-Kersey award as the nation's top female collegiate track and field performer.

Receiving her Top VIII award from Dr. Michael Adams, the president of the University of Georgia, ladies and gentlemen, Debbie Ferguson. (Applause)

Debbie will now speak on behalf of all the current student-athletes. Debbie.

RESPONSE—TOP VIII AWARDS

Debbie Ferguson (University of Georgia): Thank you, Mr. Ley.

Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, other distinguished guests, a pleasant goodnight. First and foremost, I would like to thank the Lord for giving us the strength to be here. It is readily apparent how proud each and every one is of their school—even if they weren't part of the selected few, privileged to attend the University of Georgia.

Our sincere thanks to the NCAA Executive Committee, the NCAA Honors Committee, the universities and colleges, especially

President Michael Adams, Coach Vince Dooley, the athletics director, and former track head coach, John Mitchell, the professors and counselors, all the supportive staff, and last but not least, our incredible supportive families.

You have brought us here to honor us because of our academics and athletics achievements, character and leadership. But I think it is only fitting to give tribute to the NCAA and our learning institutions, which have given us the tools and opportunities to be who and what we are tonight.

In addition, each and every honoree has made the constant sacrifice and taken time to achieve and accomplish the success that we now enjoy. At this time, I would like to congratulate all the honorees for a job well done. (Applause)

I am challenging each and every one of us to continue to strive always for excellence, realizing this top award for academics, athletics and leadership hits at the heart of ethics and how it can be maintained in the sport arena. Continue to give generously of our time and effort to influence other lives in your community. As the law of reciprocation states, the more you help others, the more your life is enhanced.

On behalf of the Top VIII award winners, thank you all for giving us the greatest life that anybody can possibly have. Thank you so much. (Applause)

SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARDS

Mr. Ley: Thank you very much, Debbie. That was marvelous. Now, as we continue with our program, it is time to honor this year's Silver Anniversary award winners.

Dianne Baker, Texas Woman's University.

Dianne was a five-sport letter-winner in softball, tennis, badminton, field hockey and soccer. My goodness.

Since her graduation, she has not slowed down one single bit. She has become one of the most successful coaches in NCAA softball history and has volunteered her time to numerous causes.

During her career at Texas Woman's University, Dianne Baker earned enough letters to dominate a game of scrabble: 14 of them in five different sports. Her favorite game, however, was softball.

After leading the Pioneers to the 1975 College World Series, Baker stepped outside the lines, and today she continues to be one of the most successful coaches in NCAA history. She spent 14 seasons at Stephen F. Austin State University, leading the LadyJacks to the Division II title in 1985. It remains the school's only national championship.

Baker is now back at her alma mater, and she is closing in on 600 victories. And forget about the Baker's dozen. She has coached 19 all-Americans during her career. She coaches the game straight from a textbook. In fact, she has written three of those and produced 16 instructional videos. And Baker doesn't keep all the goodies to herself. She donated the profits from one of those videos to the Make-A-

Wish Foundation. (Applause)

Receiving her Silver Anniversary award from Dr. Ann Stuart, president of Texas Woman's University, ladies and gentlemen, Dianne Baker. (Applause)

Ulysses "Junior" Bridgeman, University of Louisville.

"Junior" has known great success throughout his life. A basketball standout at the University of Louisville, he led the team to the NCAA Final Four back in 1975, went on to a successful 12-year career in the NBA, and now owns several Wendy's Restaurants in three separate states.

Ulysses Bridgeman is better known as "Junior," and it seems a fitting sobriquet, for on the basketball floor, Bridgeman was like the annoying little brother who just wouldn't leave you alone. His airtight defense and subtle all-round game helped spark a basketball renaissance at Louisville in the 1970s.

In his senior year, Bridgeman, an all-American, led his team to the Final Four. There, the Cardinals lost to UCLA in a game legendary Bruins coach John Wooden said was one of the finest college games ever played. From there it was on to the NBA, where Bridgeman enjoyed a distinguished 12-year career. Ten of his seasons were spent in Milwaukee, where he gave the Bucks an offensive spark off the bench.

Bridgeman was considered the NBA's top sixth man during his career, leading all NBA reserves in scoring for three straight seasons. When he retired in 1987 with a career average of nearly 14 points a game, he ranked among the Bucks all-time leaders in 11 different statistical categories. He has since returned to Louisville where he is active in the community. (Applause)

Receiving his Silver Anniversary award from Tom Jurich, the director of athletics, University of Louisville, ladies and gentlemen, Ulysses "Junior" Bridgeman. (Applause)

Lisa Rosenblum, Yale University.

Lisa had an impressive four-year record of 43 wins and two losses during her tennis career at Yale, where she lost only once in tournament competition. She has carried her winning habits into her professional life as well. Now she is a senior vice-president at Cablevision Systems Corporation.

During the 1970s, New England tennis courts were ruled by a benevolent queen, Lisa Rosenblum. For four consecutive years, Rosenblum was the top-ranked singles player for Yale University. She was quite a bulldog at the net, winning three Ivy League titles and four New England College championships. Over the course of her career, she compiled a remarkable 43-2 record in singles action.

Since her playing career ended, Rosenblum has turned from net "games" to net "gains." An accomplished executive, Rosenblum is now the senior vice-president for the Cablevision Corporation, where she oversees the synergy between Cablevision's diverse media systems. And she also serves as a state department advisor in the telecommu-

nications development of several Eastern European countries. (Applause)

Receiving her Silver Anniversary award from Barbara Chesler, the associate director of athletics, Yale University, ladies and gentlemen, Lisa Rosenblum. (Applause)

Captain John Dickson Stufflebeem, U.S. Naval Academy.

Captain Stufflebeem will advance to the rank of Rear Admiral this summer after being nominated for the position by President Clinton. He has known great success throughout his collegiate and professional careers. As a football player at the U.S. Naval Academy, Captain Stufflebeem set records that continue to rank among the best in that institution's history.

Twenty-five years ago, Navy's special-team weapon was John Stufflebeem. Stufflebeem was well practiced in the art of deception, here executing an aerial bombardment against Notre Dame. He was named the New York Times' player of the week after Navy's 1974 near upset of the Irish.

Stufflebeem could bring out the big guns when needed, as his career average of nearly 40 yards per punt still ranks fourth best in school history. After graduation, Stufflebeem went from booting punts into the sky to dropping bombs out of it.

A product of the prestigious Top Gun Flight School, he has made over 1,000 carrier landings as a Navy pilot. He served as a military aide to President Bush in 1989 and 1990. And after first learning how to pin the opposition deep in its own territory during his football career, Stufflebeem has employed those same skills in combat missions over Iraq and Bosnia. Stufflebeem's distinguished service to the country has been rewarded with a promotion to Rear Admiral from President Clinton, effective in the summer of 2000. (Applause)

Receiving his Silver Anniversary award from Vice-Admiral John Ryan, superintendent of the U.S. Naval Academy, ladies and gentlemen, Captain John Dickson Stufflebeem. (Applause)

John F. Trembley, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

John was a champion throughout his collegiate swimming career. He was a 20-time all-American and became the first swimmer to win five NCAA events in a single year. Since his college days, John has helped others reach the same kind of lofty achievements that he has reached. For instance, in the 11 years he has been the University of Tennessee swimming coach, he has coached student-athletes who have won 191 all-American honors, they have set 72 school records and they have set three American records.

If it does indeed take different strokes to rule the world, then in 1973 John Trembley was king of all the land. Trembley was ahead of the times when he went with the bald look for aerodynamics, and at the '73 NCAA championships he was way ahead of his competitors.

A Tennessee Volunteer, he became the first swimmer to win five titles in a single year. He earned an individual triple crown, winning the 500-meter freestyle, the 100 butterfly and the 100 free. He also

propelled the Vols to relay victories in the 400 free and the 400 medley events. Not surprisingly, he was named the swimmer of the year in 1973. Perhaps his most impressive feat is that he has more hair today than he did in his 20s. And underneath that hair is a coaching mind that has guided Tennessee to an 82-8 record during his 11-year reign as the Vols' coach. (Applause)

Receiving his Silver Anniversary award from Doug Dickey, the director of athletics at the University of Tennessee, ladies and gentlemen, John Trembley. (Applause)

Patrick C. Haden, University of Southern California.

While he may now be best known as a television sports commentator, Pat Haden had an outstanding collegiate and professional football career. He quarterbacked the University of Southern California team to two national championships, and subsequently played for the then Los Angeles Rams for five years. Currently, he is a broadcaster with NBC.

He was not the biggest or strongest quarterback in college football, but for three years in the 1970s Pat Haden was simply the best quarterback. Haden entered the University of Southern California after a storied career at Bishop Amat High School, and he guided the Trojans to two national championships in his three seasons at the controls.

Haden led the Trojans to the second title in his final game, the 1975 Rose Bowl. On his last collegiate pass, Haden completed the two-point conversion to give USC an 18-17 win over Ohio State.

Haden then went on to a six-year professional career, playing for his hometown Rams and earning NFC player-of-the-year honors in 1978.

When he wasn't studying play books to refine his game, he was studying the classics to refine his education. This Phi Beta Kappa and Rhodes scholar earned a degree from Oxford University while his NFL career was in full swing. Haden put his knowledge to good use, serving as a television analyst for the past 17 years.

He now calls games for NBC, and prior to that he worked for Turner and CBS. When he is not in the booth, he works as a partner in an L.A. venture capital firm. (Applause)

Receiving his Silver Anniversary award from Mike Garrett, the athletics director of the University of Southern California, ladies and gentlemen, Pat Haden. (Applause)

And now Pat Haden will speak on behalf of the Silver Anniversary winners. Pat, I congratulate you.

RESPONSE—SILVER ANNIVERSARY AWARDS

Pat Haden: Thank you, Bob, very, very much. All the Silver Anniversary award winners would like to actually thank Cecil B. DeMille for the video that you just saw. Actually, in honor of this Silver Anniversary event, I have put on 25 pounds since that last game, as you can see. My son, Taylor, that is what I looked like with

hair just so you will know.

On behalf of my fellow Silver Anniversary award winners, I want to first congratulate our Top VIII winners for the successful, but more importantly, their balanced collegiate careers. They are remarkable people, whom you have just heard about. We believe and hope it will continue to make a difference in their respective communities, colleges and schools.

We, as a class, also want to take this moment to congratulate Roger Staubach, who later will be recognized as the winner of the Theodore Roosevelt award. I had the misfortune several times of being the other quarterback when the Rams played the Cowboys. Roger had the most overactive competitive thyroid of anybody I have ever known. There was never a safe lead when Roger was the quarterback. When he played football, it was really not a game, it was more like a recital. He wasn't just a great player, Roger Staubach was a man of virtue from our class. Roger, congratulations.

To John Berry, whom you will hear from in a moment—our valor honoree—your love for your brother and your sacrifice of a kidney to save his life, and in so doing sacrifice a very promising senior season of football, that is a remarkable story.

I am particularly delighted to be asked to be the acceptance speaker for our Silver Anniversary award winners and to share this moment with Junior Bridgeman, Captain John Stufflebeem and John Trembley. But even further, I am delighted to stand here tonight with Dianne Baker and Lisa Rosenblum, and also with Stephanie Nickitas, Sally Northcroft, Debbie Ferguson and Kelly Schade in particular.

You see, I was one of the Top V award winners in 1975. It was the Top V in those years, and I made the acceptance speech. By the way, it is the same one I am giving tonight. (Laughter) I did give the acceptance speech on behalf of the five of us, all men. It was not until 1982 when we took our blinders off and recognized the incredible talents and contributions of female student-athletes in recognizing the top scholar athletes. (Applause)

So today, as the father of a Division I female student-athlete, I thank people like Dianne and Lisa for paving the way for generations of women who have followed them. In a collective thank you from our Silver Anniversary class, to the NCAA for recognizing us.

Now, you have to admit this 25th anniversary class looks pretty doggone good and well preserved. A lot has transpired over this silver anniversary period. A lot has happened in the past 25 years. I just want to give you a few of the things to think about that happened over these 25 years.

From the fall of the Berlin Wall to a more pluralistic Soviet Union, to the end of apartheid in South Africa, the freeing of Nelson Mandela, a mass market for personal computers was founded and an outstanding shrinking of the world through technology, the Internet; a company called Microsoft was founded over the last 25 years. The

U.S. women's soccer team won the World Cup and became perhaps the best sports story of 1999—once again reminding all of us who care so much about sports in this room how sports can uplift human spirits.

Now, while much has changed over the last 25 years for most of us in this room, there remains some fundamental truths technology can't change, e-commerce can't trade, the Internet can't alter—such truths as love is the best of emotions. Character counts in sports and outside of sports. As I am reminded by Dick Enberg, my friend and broadcast partner for many, many times, the words "thank you" are the two most powerful words in the universe and yet so rarely used.

Perhaps while not a fundamental truth as an accurate statement of fact and quite apropos, I think, for tonight's ceremonies, there is room in the collegiate scene for the pursuit of excellence in both athletics and academics. That makes a difference in your community—as this Silver Anniversary class has and is much more important than celebrity.

Tonight, we revel and celebrate the accomplishments of the past and present student-athletes. While we come from different generations, I believe both the Top VIII award winners as well as the Silver Anniversary award winners share the ideal of what the balance between rigorous academic work and fierce competition can bring.

In spite of the cynics of sport and all of us who deal with athletics know there are way too many out there, and in spite of what we seem to revel in the lives of some wayward athletes, and in spite of some of the jerks in sports—yes, we have some jerks—athletics still has a unique place in American culture with remarkable possibilities. Our Top VIII award winners are certainly examples of these exhilarating possibilities.

John Trembley reminded me last week how the NCAA needs to be thanked for not only recognizing student-athletes like these, but thanks for cultivating an environment where student-athletes can intellectually stretch themselves while at the same time attempt to run faster, jump higher, dive better and so on.

So, tonight is not a night of cynicism, but an evening to revel in the connection athletic competition can bring to people who seem so different, but when on a team, finds so much common ground. It is the common denominator here for us tonight as I was reminded earlier this week by Dianne Baker.

Because of the incredible possibilities in athletics potential to do such powerfully good and important things, all of us in this room need to be concerned about preserving and improving this wonderful asset we call sports. Athletic competition from fields to pools, to gyms, to tracks, to courts at its best, which it very often is, can imbue its participant with a sense of accomplishment rarely realized.

From competition can come compassion, from competition can come a development of one's sense of worth of contributing to something larger and more important than one's self. It is about excel-

lence that is uplifting. It is about sacrifice and dedication and hard work and sticking to it. Most importantly, it should be about enjoyment. Without that, it is no longer a sport.

But sometimes, because of our increasing emphasis on records and individual accomplishment, we forget the joy and the frustration from sports that should come from the performance, not just the score. We have seen that winning the national championship or being number one is the only pleasure of success when most of us realize that is not the case at all.

I am reminded of this fact by Joe Paterno, who in 1986 won his very first national championship. Joe was asked if that was his best team. Joe Paterno's response was, "I don't know if it is my best team. My best team will be the team that produces the most productive citizens."

Sports can help do that. Clearly, it is not the only way of producing productive citizens. Because of hundreds of thousands of young men and women participating in athletic competition each year—properly channeled and kept in its proper perspective—healthy competition can help teach us how to enjoy the spirit of cooperation, how to demand much of ourselves, how to sacrifice individual desires for a larger team goal. It can help teach us graceful compassion without getting strung out on winning. These are the lessons that sports can teach especially well, and when these lessons are being nurtured by us, sport is at its very best. This class of Silver Anniversary award winners fully recognizes without significant sacrifices and nurturing by others, we would not stand here today. So we proudly say "thank you."

Thank you first and foremost to our parents who taught us to meet the challenges and responsibilities of life, and to our spouses and children who have made whatever successes we have had more fun to enjoy, and to our teachers, coaches and athletic administrators of our respective universities for providing an environment for us to search for and achieve balance in our lives—where efforts and accomplishments on both sides of the hyphen in the term "student-athlete" were acknowledged and appreciated. Thank you very much. (Applause)

NCAA AWARD OF VALOR

Mr. Ley: Pat, it is our turn to say thank you for those cogent observations. Thank you very much.

Our next presentation is the NCAA Award of Valor. This honor may be presented to a coach or administrator, or to a current or former varsity letter-winner at an NCAA institution who, when confronted with a situation involving personal danger, averted or minimized potential danger by courageous action or noteworthy bravery.

This is important. The NCAA Award of Valor has only been presented seven previous times in the previous 25 years. The last time, you might remember back in 1998, to honor Shannon Smith, a very

special football player from the University of Hawaii who gave his life while saving a child from drowning.

The nomination form for the Award of Valor defines valor as the strength of mind or spirit that enables a person to brave danger with boldness and firmness.

John Berry Jr., this year's recipient of the valor award, has demonstrated he has both strength of mind and strength of spirit. This past summer, he donated a kidney to his brother who was in renal failure. In doing so, he gave up his final year of collegiate eligibility on the Williams College football team—a team for which he had been elected captain for the second season in a row. John plans to return to school this month and compete in indoor and outdoor track and graduate in June. (Applause)

John Berry says it was an easy decision to give up his final season of football at Williams College. After all, he was trading it in for something far more important—his brother's life. Last summer, John donated a kidney to save the life of his older sibling, DeAngelo, who was dying from renal failure.

Prior to the transplant, Berry had developed into one of the best defensive backs in the history of Williams College. As a junior in 1998, Berry had four interceptions and led the Ephs to an 8-0 record and was rewarded with first-team all-conference honors.

After the successful transplant and a month of recuperation, Berry was back at Williams last fall. Unable to play football anymore because a blow to his one remaining kidney would be life-threatening, Berry spent last season as an assistant coach. He will graduate this summer with a double major in biology and psychology, not to mention an honorary degree in lifesaving. (Applause)

Presenting the award to John is Richard Farley, head football coach at Williams College. Ladies and gentlemen, please join me in congratulating an extremely unique young man, John Berry, the recipient of the Award of Valor. John. (Applause)

RESPONSE—AWARD OF VALOR

John Berry (Williams College): Thank you very much for that gracious welcome, Mr. Ley. Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, many people have asked me what I would say tonight. I guess my unusual response was that I will follow the two tenets of public speaking, which are not to put my foot in my mouth, and secondly, to not put anyone to sleep.

To that end, I would like to first thank the Honors Committee that decided me worthy of this distinguished award. You can only imagine my surprise when I heard the news. Never in my wildest dreams did I ever expect anything as splendid as this to occur.

This award, to be blunt, is not a testament to the strength, mind or spirit that John Berry has. In all honesty, it is a testament to all the people who have ever extended a hand of kindness, wisdom and discipline to John Berry. I am the accomplishment of all those people.

Many of them are here tonight.

How can any person go wrong when all around him he sees the embodiments of the virtues of love and fortitude. Here tonight, I want everyone to understand I don't stand here alone. I am a vessel for all the teachings my family, my coach and my God have provided.

As I have thought of the words I would speak tonight, I thought deeply about the extraordinary act of courage that I had personally witnessed in my short life. It occurred to me that each of us has our own moments of personal triumph and tragedy.

I bet if I talked to each of you individually, you would all speak about some defining moment that you encountered, battled and overcame. Whether in victory or defeat, those moments search our minds, our hearts and our spirits to the depths of their potentials.

I have been asked if my decision was a difficult one. If there is one thing I have learned in life, it is that any decision made with love, is never truly hard. It is only right. The kidney I gave my brother represents a stamp of love—the love I have for him and the love he has always shown me.

My mom was terrified when all this took place, but as she had always said to me: "Do what you feel is right." I live that lesson every day. I kindly reminded her of it when we were making this decision. I had to remind her again when I told her of my intention to pursue a career in coaching the game of football—a sport I love and I have learned many valuable lessons from.

The most basic lesson is sacrifice—the sacrifice to a greater good. I can't think of anything greater than the love of a brother. There have been a number of publications telling the wonderful story of my family, of all the things I have said and that I have tried not to put my foot in my mouth.

There is one thing I will always remember, and I hope you will remember it. When asked the question of why I decided to give the kidney to my brother, I said: "It is the only thing to do." I think any of us, any of you here tonight, would make the same choice if you were really given a choice. I believe that with all of my heart. Thank you.

[Note: The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Mr. Ley: Thank you very much, John. From one profile in courage to another. It is time now for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors program—the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

Your program includes pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen, who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified the ideals and the purposes to which college athletics is dedicated. It is a distinguished group. As you will note, it includes former presidents, military lead-

ers and pioneers in space and medicine.

Without a doubt, all of these individuals have earned this recognition. It is easy to see that the 2000 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner also deserves the recognition of winning the coveted "Teddy" Award. He excelled in not one but three sports while at the United States Naval Academy between 1962 and 1965, winning on the football field, on the baseball diamond and on the basketball court.

Since that time, this honoree has continued to excel in his endeavors in professional athletics, in the business world and through contributions to his community.

Roger Staubach's body was long and lean, but his real talents were in his soul. When legendary Penn State coach Joe Paterno was asked what made "Jolly Roger" so good, Paterno shook his head and said: "I have no idea. If I did, I'd pass it on to my team."

Staubach's passing, honored with a Heisman Trophy, guided Navy to two landmark victories over arch-rival Army, the first coming in 1962. John F. Kennedy was on hand, and the President watched Navy's commander-in-chief pick apart the Army defense.

Playing in front of a national TV audience for the first time, Staubach's passing gave Navy the early lead. Then Staubach showcased the skills that earned him the nickname "Roger the Dodger." Staubach wasn't fast so much as quick, and no defense could hem him in. The pocket was wherever Staubach chose to make it. By game's end, Staubach had passed for two touchdowns and run for two more in Navy's 34-14 rout.

The 1963 Army-Navy classic was postponed one week to allow the nation to grieve for the recently assassinated President Kennedy. Staubach then proceeded to honor the fallen president and former Naval officer by guiding the Midshipmen to 21 unanswered points. Though he didn't score himself, this draw helped give them a 14-point cushion. In the closing seconds, Army moved the ball down near the Navy end zone, but when the Cadets couldn't get a play off in the final seconds, Navy escaped with the win.

Staubach also played basketball and baseball at the Naval Academy, earning four letters in his two auxiliary pursuits. He batted over .400 during his sophomore year while playing a mean center field. Following graduation, Staubach spent four years on active duty in the Navy before moving on to a professional career with the Dallas Cowboys.

During his 11 NFL seasons, he helped make the Cowboys "America's Team," and Staubach was America's quarterback. He was a natural leader who seemed to improve the skill of those around him.

Staubach was Houdini in spikes, an escape artist with his own bag of tricks. He could "scramble," and it was the opposition who was left with "egg on its face."

Staubach captained the Cowboys to two Super Bowl titles, and he was elected to the Pro Football Hall of Fame in 1985. The magic of

this man is best summed up by something Navy basketball coach Ben Carnevalle said when another Navy official complained that Staubach was no basketball player. "No", shot back Carnevalle, "he's a winner" (Applause)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I call upon Mr. Charles Wethington to present the NCAA Theodore Roosevelt Award to Roger Staubach, the chairman and chief executive officer of the Staubach Corporation

Mr. Wethington: Thank you. Bob. Roger, it is my pleasure to present to you the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the NCAA confers upon an individual. This award is presented to you in recognition of your lifetime of success in football, business and philanthropy, as a Hall of Fame quarterback; CEO; and community leader.

Ladies and gentlemen, an outstanding individual, Roger Staubach. (Applause)

RESPONSE—THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Mr. Staubach: Thank you, Charles. It is a privilege to be here tonight. Since they showed those films up there of the '63 Army-Navy game, the guy who scored the three touchdowns that year was Pat Donnelly. Pat is sitting out there (Applause) We reminisced today at the Donnelly home. We had a few old Naval Academy football players at his home and we were telling all kinds of sea stories and had a great time today.

It has been a great weekend in San Diego. I want to thank the Executive Committee of the NCAA and the Honors Committee, and also congratulate all the award winners here tonight. When you get older, I am not sure if you get more humble or sometimes you don't get as humble as you should be, but it is humbling to be around the youth who are here and the talents in this audience.

I thank Pat for his kind words. He is an eloquent speaker, he is a Rhodes scholar, a lawyer and he is one heck of a quarterback. I also want to thank the friends who are here tonight to honor me, and also everyone in this audience who are here to honor all the recipients tonight.

I want to thank the U.S. Naval Academy for allowing me to go to the U.S. Naval Academy. It was a school that has meant the world to me, and I have said many times that I was always proud to run on the football field as a Dallas Cowboy. When they introduced you, they gave the college and they said, "Roger Staubach, Navy."

I enjoyed my time at the Naval Academy and my four years in the Naval service. I thank Admiral Ryan for coming tonight. He is here with Captain Stufflebeem and myself. I want to thank Jack Lengyel and Tom Bates, who I guess put all the stuff together that went before the Executive Committee and the Honors Committee to select me for this award.

You know, it is an award at the end. You kind of move through the youth to the old guy. I used to sit out there and watch Chad throw

that football up on the screen. I am very jealous of that talent that you are going to see in the National Football League.

As you get older—Mike Garrett was talking to me earlier—he said: "Roger, do you remember the SC game when you played Navy?" I am thinking, "Mike, yeah, I remember that. Do I look that old?" (Laughter) Someone came up to me and mentioned that the Cowboys lost today and this is the 25th anniversary of the "Hail Mary" pass when we beat Minnesota in Minnesota. I threw a ball to Drew Pearson and we won it at the end of the game.

After the game, the Catholic kid from Cincinnati, I said: "I closed my eyes and said a Hail Mary." Drew never admitted to pushing off, and we won that game. I intentionally underthrew him and someone asked, "Do you remember that game?" I am thinking, do I remember that game?

I remember when we played Assumption in grade school and I ran the opening kickoff back. When you get older, you get a little worried.

That reminds me of a story. There were two couples who were driving down the road. They are getting a little older and forgetful at times. The two guys were in the front seat and the two gals were in the back seat. The two guys are talking back and forth. One guy said to the other guy: "You know, we went to this Italian restaurant last night. Man, it was fantastic. The food was really good, the music, the ambience, it was just a great Italian restaurant."

The other guy said: "What was the name of that restaurant?" He said: "Oh, man, what was the name of that restaurant? What is that long-stemmed flower that has thorns on it and it smells really good?" The guy said: "Well, that is a rose." He looked in the back seat and said: "Hey, Rose, what was the name of that restaurant?" (Laughter)

I will tell you what, I won't forget my wife. She is here tonight. Mary Ann is here and she was at that Assumption game. That is how far we go back. She was at all the Naval Academy games. We have been married for 35 years (Applause) I thank her.

She is a great big part of this award. Jim McCarthy, when I was in high school, decided to switch me to quarterback. I didn't want to play quarterback. I was a receiver, a defensive back. So my senior year in high school I played quarterback. I told him that I didn't want to play. He said: "Roger, I want you to play quarterback. The other guys listen to you. I want you to be the quarterback." I worked at it and I decided to give it my best and by January of that year I worked on it until I started as a senior and, you know, it was great. I enjoyed being a quarterback. The girls liked me after the game more. He changed my life, because he wanted me to be a quarterback.

I thank him and, of course, at the Naval Academy, Wayne Hart helped me develop as a quarterback. I had a great mentor with the Dallas Cowboys who was the very best in Tom Landry. I thank them for all they have done for me and are very responsible for this award, and the teammates and the others who played a role in my career.

One thing that has been mentioned is balance. Pat mentioned it. Last year, I read Bill Richardson's speech and he mentioned it. He referred to Teddy Roosevelt as his balance. Balance is a theme of many of the 20th century books that have come out that I have been reading. In getting this award, I read about Teddy Roosevelt as President from 1901 to 1909—the Rough Riders and all his stuff. He was quite a character.

But the thing that stands out was his toughness and his compassion. I have really tried to emphasize that in building the business. Also, in getting older you have got to have balance in your life. Balance is difficult because it is always "what is in it for me?"

There is a side of you that is driven. I have had that side and it is the side that your aggressiveness, your competitiveness comes out. There is nothing wrong with that as long as it is balanced with a side that puts you in other people's shoes and has compassion and has the ability to understand where someone else is coming from. If you don't have that, there is the side that is always what is in it for me that will be dominant. I think you almost become a destructive achiever.

You look good, you sound good, but there is some arrogance and there is an insensitivity. It leads to not understanding people as far as their gender or the color of their skin, or even their religion and the respect that we should have for each other.

There is a lack of respect for each other that is very, very concerning in this world today and even in our own country. Balance means that you do say what is in it for me, but at the same time you can't do it by yourself. You have to work on the side of ability that does have compassion for other people and understand where they are coming from. That is not easy to do because the natural side is always what's in it for me.

I really believe that sports teaches you the ability to get that balance. I think the NCAA is always fighting that balance as far as gender equity in sports and the ability to balance the athlete with education. It is a constant struggle in life as human beings with our frailties and our wonderful qualities to also get that balance.

I think sports teaches you the ability to appreciate someone other than just yourself. It teaches the importance of teamwork. It teaches the importance of respecting people who are of different skin color, different gender and even of different religions as far as the respect that is needed and the compassion we have for each other.

Teddy Roosevelt did have this toughness. He did have compassion. I think sport also has taught me to work each and every day to understand if I get up and don't appreciate the work I have to do, I won't get my life in balance, because it is an every day constant struggle.

The NCAA creates an opportunity that deals with its own issues to be able to give us an opportunity in sport to realize the importance that we have to each other. It is a privilege to represent the NCAA and to represent Theodore Roosevelt. He and I went to high school

together. (Laughter)

To represent him in this award and also my friends and, of course, family who are here tonight, it is a tremendous privilege for me to receive this award. Thank you very much.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Ley: Thank you very much, Roger. It is a pretty good evening for Navy. We have several people here from the home port of San Diego. As a tribute to Roger's alma mater, please join me in recognizing the director of athletics at the U.S. Naval Academy, Jack Lengyel.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Charles and all the good folks at the NCAA for the invitation to join you this evening. I have been thoroughly entertained by the people I have met, the stories we have all learned together and the lives that we have saluted because they certainly exemplify the very best in America and the very best in college athletics. Thank you very much for the invitation to be with you. I would like to turn the program back to Charles. (Applause)

Mr. Wethington: Thank you very much, Bob, for what I think was a terrific job in helping us to pay tribute to these outstanding honorees. We really appreciate your taking time to be here with us tonight. As a token of our appreciation, the NCAA will make a donation to your alma mater, Seton Hall University's radio station, WSOU, in your name. I think both you and Seton Hall deserve a round of applause. (Applause)

This has been a very special evening. For your information, tonight's festivities will air in an ESPN special Friday, February 4, at 1 p.m. Eastern time.

I want to again say "thank you" to all the award winners, particularly for allowing us to enjoy and relish in your accomplishments.

To bring a close to this special evening, Amy Huchthausen will present the benediction.

BENEDICTION

Ms. Huchthausen: As we depart, we offer our thanks for blessing us this evening. May that blessing continue to inspire us all to follow our dreams; encourage us to persist; and grant us the opportunity to excel. Let us be strong as we continue to search for the balance and joy that will allow us to fulfill our lives. Finally, grant us love, hope and peace for all the rest of our days.

Mr. Wethington: Thank you, Amy, and thank you all very much. Have a good evening and a happy new year.

[The banquet was concluded at 9:50 p.m.]

☐ Division I Forum

Monday Morning, January 10, 2000

The Division I Forum was called to order at 8:30 a.m., with Edward "Ted" Leland, Division I Management Council chair, presiding.

WELCOME

Edward "Ted" Leland (Stanford University): Good morning everyone. My name is Ted Leland. I am the director of athletics and recreation at Stanford University, and also chair of the NCAA Division I Management Council. It is a pleasure to see everybody here this morning.

You should have at your seat two pieces of material pertinent to this forum. One is a blue sheet that was prepared by the NCAA staff. You can use that to follow the discussion when we get into our power-point presentation. It is a compilation of the Basketball Working Group's proposals and alternative proposals that the members and the conferences have submitted over the past six weeks. I am hopeful that you will find it to your advantage to follow along with it.

In addition, you will find at your seat a yellow ballot. This is sort of a straw-vote ballot. We would like you to wait until the end of this discussion, and when we are done we will take a break. There will be a red box over there, and on behalf of the Management Council, I would request that you fill this out as you see fit and hand it in so we can get feedback.

Many of us who have been part of this series of forums we have had at the NCAA Conventions for Division I over the past few years will remember that we have had straw votes in terms of initial-eligibility issues and student-athlete right-to-work provisions. These basketball issues and the alternative proposals are so complex that the Management Council and staff would like you to consider them rather than vote by a show of hands. That will give you a chance for some feedback.

Our purpose this morning is to lay out the issues involved with the work of the basketball working group. It is designed to put before you some specific proposals that were developed by that working group and some alternative proposals. We would like to communicate some of the ideas behind those proposals and then listen and begin a discussion and dialogue.

My job is very simple. I am to move along the discussion, to make sure that we stay as orderly as we can, to introduce the people at the head table and to try to give you a little bit of a road map. When we get to the discussion, come to the microphones, please identify yourself by name and position, university, and who you are representing. We have a court reporter who will compile the comments from this to

make sure we are accurate in things that we attribute to you.

Let me introduce the head table. First, to my right is Ken "Buzz" Shaw, chancellor of Syracuse University. He served as chair during the past year of the Basketball Issues Working Group. He is a member of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors and is former chair of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors. He also was very involved in a lot of the transition issues. Of all of the CEOs, presidents and chancellors in the country, Chancellor Shaw has put as much time in college athletics as any of our CEOs. He is to be commended for that. Second to my left and to your right is James Haney. Jim is the executive director of the National Association of Basketball Coaches. He is the former head coach at the University of Oregon. I had the pleasure of working with him when he was a conference commissioner of the Big West Conference. To my far left, your far right, is Mike McGee, the athletic director at the University of South Carolina. He was formerly the athletic director of the University of Southern California, was a former Division I head football coach, and a national award-winner player at Duke University. He is chair of the Recruiting Subcommittee of the Academics and Eligibility Cabinet. To my far right is David Knight. David is a professor of chemistry and the faculty athletics representative at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. He is chair of the Academics and Eligibility Cabinet. He is a consultant to the Board of Directors of the NCAA regarding initial-eligibility issues, and he is past chairman of the faculty reps association. He is another individual who has put an extraordinary amount of time into the betterment of college athletics. Judy Devine, who is to my right and seated to your left, is the senior woman administrator of Kent State University. She is chair of the continuing-eligibility committee of the Academics and Eligibility Cabinet and also a member of that cabinet. We have two NCAA staff people here. To my immediate left and to your right is Steve Mallonee, who will do a lot of the presentation today. He is director of membership services and liaison to the Division I governance. Group. As part of the NCAA staff, he probably, more than anybody else in this room besides myself, has memorized the NCAA Manual. That is a joke. Those of you who know me know how funny that is. He graduated from the University of the South in Sewanee, Tennessee, and got his law degree from the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. To the second to my right and third from your left, is Tom Jernstedt, senior vice-president of the NCAA. He oversees the men's and women's basketball championships, and is a former student-athlete from the University of Oregon. Quite honestly, some people have called him the father of the men's NCAA basketball tournament. He has done just an outstanding job.

What we have laid out for you is for Chancellor Shaw to make some introductory remarks and then we will break our presentation into three segments. On each one of those segments, we'll use the overhead projector and our video equipment to talk about different

proposals and alternative proposals. Then we will have a member of the basketball working group make a short presentation on that particular issue. I will moderate a five- to seven-minute discussion. We will go through three of those issues in that format. So, a power-point presentation, followed by a member of the committee, followed by a discussion. We will try to avoid confusion from issue to issue. At the end, we will have as much time as we can for discussion. We have an hour-and-one-half for this, and some very difficult issues. We will try to go as quickly as we can.

The first issue will be summer aid. That is Proposal 99-120 and the alternatives. The second issue will be financial aid—overall and initial counters. That is 99-121 and 122. The third issue we will address will be the recruiting calendar, which is 99-129 and alternatives.

It is a great turnout this morning. Obviously, these are issues you are interested in. Let me turn it over to Chancellor Shaw.

BASKETBALL WORKING GROUP PROPOSALS

Kenneth "Buzz" Shaw (Syracuse University): Thank you very much, Ted. As you know by now, the Division I Board of Directors created a 29-member working group and charged it with examining any and all of the issues that have a significant impact on the sport of Division I basketball.

Our job was to make appropriate recommendations, legislative or otherwise, to be reviewed through the Division I governance structure. We conducted seven meetings, reviewed results from surveys of the membership and basketball student-athletes, and conducted hearings involving more than a dozen constituent groups and interested individuals.

We listened to all of this. We listened to those who came before us. We listened to you, our constituents, and we listened to each other. We did a lot of listening to each other. Our final recommendations are really directed toward four significant objectives.

First, to increase educational opportunities and the likelihood of academic success for our students. Second, to more fully prepare our young athletes to contribute to society as productive citizens. Third, to modify the basketball playing and practice season to provide more time for athletes for academics and other core-curricular activities. And fourthly, to provide support programs and services that enhance the overall collegiate experience.

Now that this report is complete, the Board has referred it to the governance structure for consideration. As you know, the Board endorsed the principles of the report and requested that the Management Council chaired by Ted prepare legislative proposals and send them out for membership comment.

Several conferences have now submitted alternative proposals. The Board of Directors remains convinced that a change in the culture of basketball is necessary. I hope that we will be bold in address-

ing the areas that have been identified. Ultimately, the work we do between now and April will serve to protect and enhance this wonderful sport.

To answer Ced Dempsey's question of yesterday, why are we here, our committee did this because we were concerned about the future of the game. We were concerned about our young athletes. We put together a package that we could support.

You will notice that I emphasize the word "package." I would dare say that all 29 of us had pieces of that package that we would have liked to have been different. We thought some parts needed to be strengthened or to be perhaps weaker. It was the package that we were after, and it was the package that we could agree to.

I found these 29 people to be remarkable people—not unlike the overall membership. As a matter of fact, the demographics of our group, the results of the initial survey, and the attitudes and beliefs going into our committee meetings were remarkably similar to the membership. We spent a lot of time together. We influenced one another in many ways. Now we believe that we have a strong package.

Let me take a few minutes and talk about change. Someone said that change has its enemies. These 29 people spent hundreds of hours—literally hundreds of hours of their time—because you told us that change was needed. Now, it is time to do something on behalf of the interests of basketball to ensure its continuous health.

The interesting thing about change—and I see myself as a student of leadership—is that change has its detractors and it has its supporters. Sometimes it is the supporters who keep change from occurring. If we are not part of the solution, and there is no solution, then we are helping to make the problem worse.

Of course, we have different views of what the problems are. We focused on the ones that you will be hearing about. But generally, when we have proposed change, we do it for one of three reasons. First, we don't think there is anything wrong. That is a good reason. If there is nothing wrong, if it is not broke, why fix it?

Second, we don't mind change. As a matter of fact, we will endorse it so long as our institution is not disadvantaged or so long as our institution is advantaged.

Thirdly, we desperately want change when the change that we are seeing is not enough. So, therefore, it doesn't deserve our support. Now, for those of us who oppose whatever package comes before us in April, it must be because we believe one of the reasons we oppose it is that all is well.

I would submit to you that all isn't well, and I think you would agree. I would ask you if you oppose the changes that will come forward because you believe all is well, I ask you, if you are an athletics director, what are you going to tell your presidents as to why he or she should oppose it and what are you going to tell the local press?

All is well is what you will have to say. Or perhaps you oppose

the changes because they affect you negatively or not positively enough. We went through a lot of this on our committee because we are human beings. As someone once said, "where you stand on a position depends on where you sit."

We have all found ourselves sitting in different places. We listen to one another. We listen to one another on probably what was the most contentious and divisive issue, and that is freshman eligibility or ineligibility. This was a where-you-stand and where-you-sit situation.

Everybody's opinion was made respectfully and actually with a great deal of conviction. For those of us who find ourselves with programs that are generally in the top 20 or 30, it was a lot easier to support freshman ineligibility.

Yet, we listened when the president of Valparaiso University says that all is well and good, that every one of our athletes, every one of our basketball players over the last X number of years, has graduated. So what problem is it that we are fixing here? We had to listen to one another.

If we end up opposing significant reform because it isn't in our institutional interests, or it doesn't make our lives better, then again we will have to answer to our critics and answer to our own conscience.

As I mentioned earlier, the third reason for opposing change might well be that it is not enough; it is not good enough. As I mentioned earlier, the problem is that no one on our committee doesn't have suggestions as we sit here today to make a piece of this package better. But in the last analysis, leadership is the art of the impossible. We came to this with strongly held views. We modified them as we saw what was possible. I hope at the end of the day that what we do in these deliberations will make things better.

I was asked to comment briefly about what I believed the directors want. I think what the directors want is this: The directors want an end product that speaks to our original concerns, your concerns, my concerns, members of the committee. The directors want the best possible package that we can support. Let's hope it is better than what we are presenting to you today. For those of you who want to make it better—I sincerely would like to see that occur—let me ask that you ask yourselves two questions.

The first is: "Will this really make the package better?" If so, let's hear about it. Secondly: "Can it be sold to our constituents?" If it is better and it can be sold, let's ask ourselves what it will do to the package that we present with much pride.

I view the discussion today as one more step toward possible change leading to a Management Council recommendation to the Board with constituent reactions by April. In April, if we are not united in a comprehensive plan to improve the status of basketball, woe is to us. I think that we can be.

I would be very happy and very proud of this Association if by

April we could come forward with a significant reform proposal that we as a body can accept. That's the right thing to do. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Leland: Steve Mallonee will now begin his presentation on the first of three segments dealing with some of the specifics that are pertinent to 99-120 and the amendments.

Steve Mallonee (NCAA Staff): The first set of proposals that we are going to look at here—and we will do it through a power-point presentation—relates to summer financial aid and in particular the time period prior to a student-athlete's initial enrollment at the institution.

There are three proposals to look at this morning, and then you will have a chance to discuss them. The proposal we have designed is consistent with the working group's objective to enhance the overall collegiate educational experience and to provide a head start for those individuals to start making progress toward graduation and maybe get a foundation that is free from the competitive pressures that occur during the academic year.

The working group's proposal in this area is No. 99-120-A. That proposal will allow your institutions to provide athletically related financial aid to entering students—either a freshman or transfer—during the summer prior to initial enrollment, which could include the individuals who are qualifiers or those who have not been certified as qualifiers, provided those individuals are enrolling in at least a minimum of six hours of course work that is accessible for degree credit in any of the institution's degree programs.

The proposal's effective date would be immediate, which would be for this summer, if it were to pass. That's the working group's proposal. Judy will talk about that a little more in just a second. There are two alternative proposals that were submitted by conferences that relate to this issue.

The first of those is No. 99-120-B, which came from the Southeastern Conference. That proposal and how it differs from the working group, is that basically it will apply to all sports, not just the sport of basketball. Second of all, it would only require a minimum of five hours of independent enrollment as opposed to six.

The proposal does require that for individuals to receive aid, they must be certified as a qualifier or a partial qualifier. Also, there is a restriction that financial aid can be awarded for no more than four subsequent summer sessions. There is a time-period restriction on there.

The second alternative proposal, which was submitted and came from the Big Ten, is No. 99-120-B. That is identical to the working group's proposal with one exception—in meeting the minimum six-hour requirement in the summer, it would not be permissible to use physical education or physical activity courses. Those are the three proposals that relate to summer financial aid.

At this time, I will turn it over to Judy to give some brief com-

ments about the development of the proposal from the working group, and then we will open it up for discussion.

Judy Devine (Kent State University): Thank you, Steve. As the working group began to explore ways to enhance educational opportunities that would increase the likelihood of academic success, the former concept of freshman ineligibility was one of the first ideas that we looked at.

Low graduation rates and high attrition rates in men's basketball justified consideration of a different eligibility and financial aid structure for this sport. As with most of the issues we faced, we thoroughly explored the pros and cons, the advantages and disadvantages, the gains and losses, of each idea.

The primary advantage of freshman eligibility is that it provides a reasonable transition time for student-athletes to absorb the priority of academic responsibility, and then to meet a standard of academic performance and success as a precursor to athletics participation.

While the concept is academically sound in every regard related to important issues, while there are deliberations, is it fair to not allow the academically sound entering freshman the opportunity to participate immediately? If freshmen are ineligible, how many more grants are necessary? How do those increases impact the competitive paradigm, institutional program costs, Title IX concerns and gender equity? Would the Association be subject to further litigation for restricting access to its playing field? Would freshmen truly be ineligible or would we create freshmen or JV teams with their accompanying schedules, coaching staffs and operational budgets?

Would we have need for the NCAA eligibility clearinghouse to determine any status for entering basketball players since they would all be ineligible and, if not, would each institution's admissions standard alone guarantee sufficient academic preparedness for handling the rigors of a Division I academic and athletics commitment?

While the concept was ideal, these issues and others led the various groups surveyed and eventually the working group to abandon for now the idea of freshman ineligibility. A compromised position then surfaced that suggested mandatory ineligibility for all initial enrollees through the first term.

This maintained the academic priority and academic performance-based merits of total freshman ineligibility, but eliminated the major concerns about increased scholarships and program costs. Student-athletes, however, were going to be forced to sacrifice participation in approximately 10 games during their initial season of eligibility waiting for the first term to end.

The two solutions to that problem suggested either extending the four seasons of eligibility through a fifth permissible year of play, or moving the basketball season to a one-semester sport. The latter idea has merit, but it is not currently feasible in light of the marketability of the catch phrase "March Madness" and the terms and

availability of the Association's TV coverage.

The working group finally decided that more time needed to be devoted to academic priority and transition. The only remaining solution was to encourage and allow basketball student-athletes to begin earlier. We therefore proposed funding attendance during the summer prior to initial enrollment.

Summer enrollment would allow basketball student-athletes an opportunity to devote their primary attention to academic priorities and to develop an academic foundation free from the pressures and demands of competition, travel and high visibility. It should be noted that the concept of summer financial aid prior to initial enrollment has been addressed several times by the Association and has failed many feel because of the financial implications on the program budgets. The working group did discuss the possibility that the Association explore avenues from basketball revenues to assist institutions in financially supporting attendance at such summer sessions.

As it turns out, what was finally proposed between the suggestion of permissible summer athletic financial aid and Proposal 124 regarding the eligibility standards to be met after the first fall term, satisfies the original merits of freshman ineligibility, which were to provide a reasonable transition time for student-athletes to absorb the priority of academic responsibility and then to meet a standard of academic performance and success as a precursor to athletics participation.

I would like to point out that the summer financial aid proposal is one of many interrelated pieces to the puzzle of changing the culture and environment surrounding Division I men's basketball. This piece allows us to begin to change the student-athletes' focus during the first term on campus from athletics practice and play to nothing but academic preparedness, good study habits, time and stress management, and other transitional program elements.

Proposal No. 123, which would allow nonqualifiers to receive athletic financial aid, is a piece necessary to not only improve access to a college education, but also to prevent compliance violations for student-athletes offered summer school aid and who eventually are determined to be nonqualifiers.

We faced several issues with the timeliness of eligibility certification and access to summer school financial aid. The later start of a season—Proposal No. 126—is a piece that emphasizes a longer focus on academic priorities prior to the start of practice and competition.

The continuing-eligibility standard in Proposal No. 124 provides the piece that demands a more central concentration on academics, not on athletics. It rewards desired outcomes of academic performance. Our working group has taken the puzzle out of the box and has begun to assemble its individual pieces. We encourage and welcome your assistance in helping to define each piece so the overall picture of the change can be completed. Thank you.

Mr. Leland: Thank you. Those presentations were excellent.

We have time for eight to 10 minutes for people to move to the microphones and make comments or ask questions of the panel. All of us are eligible to answer any questions that you might have.

By the way, anybody who is in the back and would like to sit at a more comfortable place, there are some seats up here in the middle. Feel free now to move. You will not embarrass anybody if you want to move to a more comfortable place. The staff is trying to bring in more chairs. We have an excellent turnout this morning. Someone must have heard I was speaking. (Laughter)

Now, please try to create some give and take. We are not presenting a fait accompli, we are presenting a package in small pieces and we would like some comments on it.

Deborah Yow (University of Maryland, College Park): Could someone on the committee please comment on any input or feedback that you might receive from the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee?

Mr. Leland: I don't think we have received any yet.

Mr. Mallonee: During the deliberations of the working group, we heard presentations from various outside groups—quite a few of them. One of the groups that they did hear from was the student-advisory committee.

Two student-athletes—one young man and one young woman—met with the working group and discussed areas of concern and had the opportunity to provide their input to the group regarding the various issues that had been outlined. My recollection, Debbie, was that the presentation focused primarily on the recruiting aspects, particularly some of the issues related to early telephone calls and things of that nature. They were provided an opportunity and did speak on behalf of the full Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Unidentified Delegate: In response to trying to make summer academics focused, you stated that it might be problematic in terms of coaches making it mandatory to practice on campus. How does that occur voluntarily? How do you regulate mandatory practices during the summer if you have freshmen or other students who are staying on campus? I would like to know how you plan to regulate that.

Mr. Leland: How do we plan to regulate what she referred to as the "voluntary mandatory summer work out"?

Mr. Shaw: First of all, it would be unwise for us to assume that 18-year-olds are so exhausted by the end of the day that they have used up all their physical juices. Probably most of us sitting here would feel that way. So we intentionally did not want to get into a long discussion of, "let's be sure these young men aren't playing basketball," because we assumed they will be. We also assumed that the NCAA and the component institutions can abide by whatever rules are there.

That is what occurs in the fall before the basketball season starts. Perhaps some of you are cynical about that. Nevertheless, there is a

way of dealing with that. Our assumption was that this was going to be fundamentally academic, that these young people would have some time—whether on their own or in small groups—to not practice in any organized way, but to loan their support. We don't find that to be a problem—particularly if they are spending eight to 10 hours a day in their academic endeavors.

Mr. Mallonee: As a point of clarification, in the Texas proposal, there is a prohibition against being in organized activities. That is similar to the current legislation that relates to incoming students getting need-based aid. That is part of the legislation.

Obviously, you may have a greater number of kids who are taking advantage of the opportunity, but the requirement for the institution to monitor that still exists.

Eugene Doris (Fairfield University): I applaud the proactive work of the group. The question I have is if No. 120 goes through immediately, has the working group looked into how many institutions have programs that would fit the legislation and what type of competitive disadvantage that might create for those institutions that do not have programs that would fit the legislation?

Mr. Mallonee: I don't know that the committee looked specifically at that issue. I think that the committee felt that the minimum was six hours of work that would go toward any degree program and that all institutions should have the opportunity to potentially take advantage of the proposal. I don't know that they addressed that issue for that reason.

Petrina Long (University of California, Irvine): In the follow-up to that last comment, in California, we have had programs for over 20 years that are for economically disadvantaged students. In fact, those programs are often called "bridge" programs.

Many of our summer preparatory programs for outreach students do not include credit hours toward graduation. I would ask the committee to just understand that so we are not put in the position of creating a separate program.

I realize this will be a monitoring problem, but I would think that you want to use the successful programs that we already have for mainstream students on our campuses. I would urge you to take a look at that.

Unidentified Delegate: Maybe this is clarified somewhere. Didn't the students have to pass the courses in the summer? Are there any regulations as they begin? What does that mean? Is this now 24 plus 6 that has to be completed by the second year?

Mr. Mallonee: First of all, it relates to this proposal, which obviously is permissive in nature to provide the aid. There is a separate proposal from the working group that would require qualifiers to be certified at the end of the first semester and to make progress to at least successfully complete 12 hours of degree credit with the 2.0, and they could use summer work.

Then they would be recertified after the first year based on the

24 hours, not on additional hours. So the idea was that they could get a head start by going to summer school and start laying the proper academic foundation. It wasn't increasing the number of hours they needed for the first year.

Judy Devine (Kent State University): The other part of having that criteria at the end of the fall term is to provide the early-warning system to catch kids before they get into such a deep hole that they cannot recover. So it was a combination. If the students choose to go to the summer term, then they can reflect those hours plus the fall term in terms of their eligibility.

Jerry Kingston (Arizona State University): I fully support the concept of summer school financial aid for students. I want to try to identify some issues that perhaps will make that more palatable to the group. One of the concerns that I have is the award of financial aid is for nonqualifiers, which is part of the package that was correctly pointed out. Because of the eligibility certification timeliness, it would not be possible to know for certain the eligibility status of the incoming freshman before arrangements needed to be made.

The Southeastern Conference has an amendment that says we will deal with their problem by saying you have to be a partial or a full qualifier. I find that problematic again because of the timing issue. But there may be some folks who will vote against this proposal because they are concerned about the award of financial aid to nonqualifiers.

I am wondering if the committee would be willing to consider redefining the concept of when an initial full-time enrollment is triggered. For many other rules, we don't consider to have that happen in the summer. So we could allow the student-athletes to come in on athletically related aid for the summer, sort out their eligibility status later, and not have institutional violations as a result of learning later that you had awarded financial aid to nonqualifiers. I think that would help sell the package. I offer that as a positive idea. Thank you.

Race Bergman (Middle Tennessee State University): If you passed this for basketball, won't there be some quick lawsuits from other sports that they would want to be in that also?

Judy Devine (Kent State University): There are several of these suggestions that we hope would be a model for other sports. Our charge was to address one sport only. If it is a good idea and if it works, then certainly I think the membership should look at a lot of these things and say if it is good for that one, it probably should be good for this one.

Mr. Bergman: I will be very brief. Regarding tying this in with graduation rates.... I am in favor of graduation rates. When you start dealing with typical state universities for first-generation college students, and we talk about decentralization of power now within the NCAA, and then you immediately superimpose reward structures for graduation rates, it bothers me to some extent because we should be

dealing with the ethics of the institutions and dealing with fairness in regard to that instead of taking kids off the market for reward assistance.

Mr. Mallonee: Our legal counsel will review and has reviewed each of these proposals and will report to the full Management Council in April. The issue that you raised about the impact of a particular proposal on one set of students and having the appropriate data has not been lost on legal counsel. Things like that will be raised at the appropriate time.

Mr. Shaw: I think the second question our colleague asked really plagued us. We were running out of time—not with thoughts, but we were running out of time. I think you can make a very good case for a substitute for graduation.

We were unable in the time period that we had to do that. First of all, I am in favor of rewards and punishments. As a matter of fact, I think the rewards and the punishments are not extreme enough.

I think the programs that are putting the students in good standing should be rewarded and those that really are not should be punished. But the problem, as I think you are saying, is that from a state university and a lot of other places, there is enough turnover in regular students that it is very hard to justify the graduation rate as the criterion.

One of the possibilities that the Management Council could look at would be to substitute good standing. I wouldn't believe that good standing meant what the NCAA now says you have to have to be eligible. For example, at Syracuse, we are looking at a proposal that says at the end of the first year students have to be in good standing. That means they will have to have passed 30 hours or more. That is 60 hours at the end of the second year and 90 and so on.

If the student leaves for a variety of good reasons to them, and let's assume there are some very good reasons to them, they are not having left as not being students, they left for other reasons. I think that is one of the areas that I am sure the Management Council will want to look at.

I would hope that the concept of holding us accountable as institutions—whether it is good standing or graduations—that that concept is upheld.

Carolyn Campbell (Ivy Group): To follow up that question about other sports, I was wondering if there is any data other than graduation rates that show we should give basketball players in particular this advantage. There are certainly other sports that have comparable graduation rates.

What kind of data are there to show that this additional work in the summer is going to really help the basketball graduation rates?

Mr. Shaw: I can only speak to the first part of that question. The second part—what kind of data would show that this would be advantageous—would have to be anecdotal. Many of us have problems that bring students in during the summer and they do quite well. That is anecdotal.

Regarding the first question of why is basketball different? I think that there are people here who can talk about the graduation rates as being different.

There is a second reason why the NCAA put together a group of 29 people for basketball. That is not because basketball in some way is just going under. As a matter of fact, it is doing very well. But basketball was singled out because, as I understand it, 92 percent of the revenue for the NCAA, and much of the revenue for your programs, comes from that sport. For us to have students who are not doing well academically hurts a lot more in that area than it does in others.

Mr. Mallonee: Carolyn, I do think we have talked to our research staff, and as Chancellor Shaw said, a lot of it is anecdotal. There are some studies that I believe would lend some support. There is some evidence that the people do get a head start and graduate on a more timely manner if they are allowed to get summer financial aid. I think there are some out there. It is probably a variety of ways that that has been studied.

Eugene Doris (Fairfield University): If No. 123 doesn't pass with regard to giving aid to nonqualifiers, would that move 120-A?

Mr. Mallonee: No, it would not. No. 123 basically would be giving the ability to get aid during the first academic year. If it were not to pass, it would not impact the ability of someone who is not certified in the summer prior to the initial enrollment to receive aid during that time period.

Mr. Leland: Let's move on to our next presentation, and that has to do with Nos. 99-121 and 122.

Mr. Mallonee: We have touched a little bit on those in our first discussion. The proposals here are actually six proposals. There are four proposals that relate to 99-121 and deal with counters or overall limits in the sport of men's basketball and two proposals that deal with the establishment of initial counters in men's basketball.

As it has been mentioned, these are models that are attempting to provide some accountability and some incentive and effort to hopefully increase graduation rates. The diversity of these proposals includes one that was developed by the working group. Proposal No. 99-121-A would establish an incentive-based model whereby financial aid awards would be based on an institution's graduation rates on a four-year average.

The graduation rate would be calculated in the same way you now are required to by the Department of Education for meeting NCAA graduation rates. However, you would be able to exclude athletes who had left the institution in good academic standing—those athletes who may have transferred or departed early to the NBA—but return and be academically eligible.

They are allowed to be excluded from that calculation. In accordance with the calculations, schools that have a graduation rate of 75 percent or higher in the sport of men's basketball would be able to receive an additional grant, or a 14th counter, if you will. Those that

are below 32 percent—that is the punishment—will be 12. They will be required to reduce their grants-in-aid by one, from 13, which is the current rule, to 12. Those between 33 and 75 would maintain the 13. There is a caveat that an institution could lose no more than one grant or retain no more than one grant in any given academic year.

You have three alternative proposals. The first one, 99-121-B, comes from the SEC and that differs from the working group proposal. First of all, it would apply to all sports. Second of all, it does not base the award on the graduation rate.

What it does is require institutions to continue to count student-athletes who depart the institution's team who were not in good academic standing. So if they leave the team and they would not have been eligible had they returned the next year, those individuals would have to continue to count for all the remaining seasons of competition that they have. So if they were entering in the four years, they would continue for a four-year period. If there were two-year college transfers, it would be for a two-year period. So the institution would still be held accountable for their scholarship.

Alternative Proposal 99-121-C, which is coming from the Big Ten, is somewhat similar to the one I just mentioned from the SEC with a couple of exceptions. First of all, institutions would continue to count student-athletes who depart the institution as opposed to the team. If a student-athlete left the institution and was not in good academic standing, then they would continue to have to count for the remaining seasons of competition—leaving the institution as opposed to leaving the team. The Big Ten proposal only relates to Division I men's basketball and not in all sports.

The final alternative proposal in No. 121 is somewhat an offshoot of the working group proposal being submitted by the Pac-10. It differs from the working proposal only to the degree that it only establishes two tiers. It doesn't impose any punishment for a lower graduation rate. It would reward an institution that has a graduation rate that is 75 percent or over with 14 grants. Below 75 percent, the institutions would continue to be able to still award 13.

There are two proposals that relate to the establishment of initial counters. There is one coming from the working group, which is 99-122-A. Again, this was an effort by the group to address the concerns related to high attrition rates. This proposal would establish a limit of four on the initial grants that an institution could provide in the sport of men's basketball during any given academic year. It has an effective date of August 1, 2001. To provide an appropriate time period to prepare for that, there is an alternative proposal being submitted by the Ivy Group that would exclude individuals who are receiving non-athletically related aid from being included as one of the four included as a counter. Those are the six proposals that relate to institutional financial aid limits.

I will turn it over to David to make a few comments, and then we will have discussion.

David Knight (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): Thanks, Steve. The working group took very seriously the charge of the presidents that we alter the culture of basketball in regard to improving academic performance of basketball student-athletes.

As has been pointed out, the prevailing sentiment of the working group is that Proposals 99-120 through 125—in the form they came from the working group—should be viewed as a package aimed at improving academic attainment of basketball players.

Proposals 121 and 122 recommended limits in the overall number of grants-in-aid in basketball and recommended limits in the maximum number of grants-in-aid allowable in any one year. Graduation rates in men's basketball are among the lowest of any sport in the NCAA, and graduation rates for transfers among men's basketball players are even lower. They are among the lowest for any sports group in our Association.

The working group felt that Propositions 121 and 122 taken together would have a beneficial effect on academic performance of basketball players for reasons that I will outline. All available data indicate that there is a large amount of transferring and other types of attrition in Division I basketball.

The incidents of transferring is greatest in the higher-profile conferences. The working group feels that the scholarship agreement between institutions and recruited basketball players in Division I has in too many instances become a devalued commodity.

On the one hand, due to various dissatisfactions, a disturbingly large number of student-athletes initiate efforts to transfer. On the other hand, for various reasons, a disturbingly large number of coaches often urge student-athletes to transfer and these coaches are rather active in helping these student-players to transfer.

For whatever reason, when basketball players do transfer, they become statistically grouped with student-athletes who are least likely to graduate. The working group has sought to reduce the instance of transferring into Division I basketball and to reinvest value in the scholarship agreement.

One of the ways to do this is to limit the number of initial scholarships as in Proposal No. 122. If there is an upper limit on the number of initial scholarships, coaches may have to exercise more care in their offers. The student-athletes may find it harder to transfer if the programs to which they wish to move to do not have available offers. Players are more likely to remain at one institution and all our statistics indicate they will thus have a greater likelihood of academic success as measured by graduation.

In Proposal No. 121, the working group proposes an incentive plan that ties the total number of basketball scholarships in an institution to the graduation rates of players. The working group feels that such a plan will also work to reinvest value in the scholarship arena. If coaches stand to increase the total number of allowed scholarships by graduating their players or to lose a scholarship if their

players do not graduate, then they will likely exercise more care in offering their limited number of scholarships per year to student-athletes who have a good likelihood to graduate.

Now, some comments about the compilation of graduation rates, because it is important to the discussion. Graduation rates for scholarship basketball players are calculated six years after their initial enrollment. Suppose, for example, a school gave four initial grants in 1989 and six years later two of these four individuals graduated for this entering class, the graduation rate would be 50 percent. The six-year graduation rates for subsequent entering classes would be computed in the same way. A four-year average of these six-year graduation rates would then be determined. It is this four-year average that would be the basis for determining the total number of grants-in-aid permitted for an institution.

For successive years, a rolling four-year average would be maintained. The working group recognizes that some transferring and some other attrition is bound to occur, and we recommend that institutions not be penalized in these calculations if the student left the first institution in good academic standing. If the leaving player were eligible to compete at the first institution had he remained, then this transfer student would not be counted in the graduation rates for purposes of 121. That would affect the size of the denominator in the calculations.

The working group feels that the limitations on the number of initial counters as in Proposal No. 122 is key. They are very important in this issue and in combination with 121 will ultimately be instrumental in increasing graduation rates of basketball players.

The high number of transfers in men's basketball players should be reduced. The institutions would be encouraged to recruit student-athletes who can succeed academically at their institutions, and we would expect the men's basketball graduation rates to increase because coaches and member institutions would have a direct incentive to increase graduation rates.

Joe Wyatt (Vanderbilt University): I rise to make a few comments about this proposal and to say a few words about the Southeastern Conference proposal.

First of all, I think it has been stated already, but I certainly believe that this proposal will not restrict itself to basketball. It will either be expanded initially to include all sports or the other sports will fall into some sort of sequence. I think that we need to keep that very much in mind.

I would also say that this matter, as I see it, does not relate just to athletics. Athletics are cherished. Athletics are revered by so many of the population in this country that, in fact, it is going to affect academic performance and the standards for academic performance at every college and university and at every K through 12 school.

I am particularly addressing the K through 12 issue. Right now,

this country has serious problems with its K through 12 system. I don't need to relate those to you. You all know about them. They are so serious, in fact, that all of the presidential candidates at the present time are including education as one of their top issues to address. The reason they are doing this is that they are getting that response from the political mechanisms that will cause them to be elected. I think that the difficulty that I have more than any other with this proposal can be seen from the illustration before you. It says that par for the course would be two-thirds of your basketball players do not graduate. I think that is simply unacceptable. Let me just put it in another term. Suppose we were to be interpreted as taking a position and saying it is okay if two-thirds of the high-school basketball players who entered high school as freshmen did not graduate from high school or middle school.

This is simply something that cannot be defended in terms of the real purposes of our colleges and universities in my view. I think that one of the weaknesses that "Buzz" Shaw has already pointed out is the calculations are a tricky way of calculating graduation rates. It makes it somewhat more difficult.

That takes us to a proposal that the Southeastern Conference passed nine to zero with one abstention among the universities. I would just say as a sidebar that this is a difficult issue. I want to congratulate the committee, and "Buzz" in particular who has worked hard on this. "Buzz" is a valued colleague.

I have been the chancellor at Vanderbilt for 18 years, and "Buzz" has been at the University of Wisconsin and now Syracuse, giving him both public and private university experience. I have attended, I believe, every one of the NCAA meetings for 18 years. This was a problem 18 years ago—this business of the academic performance of our athletes—and it continues to be a problem. I must say I don't believe it has gotten better.

It is very clear that there is a division among the academic side of the university and the athletics side of the university for entirely understandable reasons. Our proposal in the Southeastern Conference, as it was winning its way through, was generally opposed by the athletics directors and generally approved by the faculty representatives.

It took the presidents of the universities to sort this out. That is where the buck stops on this issue. It is related to the standing of colleges and universities in our society. We are a privileged group of institutions. We are charitable entities. People who give us money get tax deductions. We are revered because of our role in training young people for the future of the country. I would say to you that the requirements for a productive citizen for the 21st century in terms of having a job, having a career, are going to be much more dependent on their academic qualifications than they have ever been before.

We must not preserve the status quo, we have to take the requirements up a notch that we total for our students to graduate from high

school, college or any other level of educational experience. I think that we will be in a situation with a proposal that says it is all right for two-thirds of our athletes not to graduate, where it could be—and I would say successfully—argued that that puts this whole enterprise into a situation where it is virtually unrelated to the educational process. It is an unrelated business. Fine, if you want to have a business like that; but not fine if you want to be a university and host a business like that.

In summary, I hope you will have other forums in which to discuss this. I would urge the committee to consider the proposal that is really very straightforward from the Southeastern Conference as modified somewhat by the Big Ten and others to judge the performance of athletes on the basis of their academic standing at any point in time; to motivate the coaches to require that the students are attending class and doing their academic work every day of every semester of every year.

Having said that, if the student does not stay in good academic standing, then the institution loses the scholarship in that sport until that student would have graduated. It is straightforward; it is simple. I would admit that it relies on the integrity of the institution and the courses they consider as adequate requirements for graduation. But anything we do is going to rely on that.

Therefore, I think that it really is a matter that deals with the integrity of our colleges and universities. I congratulate the committee on considering it in that light. It is very clear from the statements that Chancellor Shaw has made that he considers it that way.

I would urge more to really look at this from the attitude of not just athletics but education in the largest sense and its role in this society. Thank you.

Steve Holton (Northern Arizona University): While I commend the committee, I also have some concerns in that time the graduation rate for scholarships may lead us to putting student-athletes into certain academic programs that maybe are not their first choice to maintain that good standing.

I also have concerns that it may proliferate our opportunities to make sure that the students complete their course work in good standing by the university before they leave. If they are going to transfer and they are not in good standing, I would be concerned about how it may be initiating the process to allow them to leave in good standing. Thank you.

Josephine R. Potuto (University of Nebraska, Lincoln): I also would like to commend the committee for the hard work and the really thoughtful set of proposals. But in addition, I want to express some dogmatic sentiments about the fast tracking of this—what I think hasn't been a good service to the deliberative process, particularly on the campuses when we received proposals on the 26th of December and were supposed to be responding in a very, very short period of time. I actually have two questions.

One is general and it relates to the comments I just made. What is the process from here out? On some of these proposals that we see in Nebraska, we like pieces of one and pieces of another. If the Management Council could opt simply to vote upward or down based on conference directions, then at least in Nebraska we don't think we are going to get necessarily the best proposal.

I think there are a number of suggestions to the committee to consider "A" or consider "B" or consider "C". At least in Nebraska, we don't understand how those things are going to be considered and moved in the process. I would appreciate some assistance with that.

The particular question I have is with respect to 122-A and the limitation on initial counters. As we read this, there is no exception for situations such as the career entries or the elimination of the degree program on a campus that might lead someone, a player, to leave the team but would not have any relationship to trying to drive out a player or run them in and run them out.

Presently, if that is the correct understanding of that proposal, we are opposed to the proposal because there is no counting for situations such as that that are not really, we think, in the intent of what the committee is attempting to do. Thank you.

Mr. Mallonee: I will try to address both of your questions. The first one, in terms of the process—you mentioned December 27th—the initial proposals that were supported by the working group as well as whatever alternative proposals that had been received as of the October Management Council meeting, were distributed for comment to the membership in early November with a 60-day deadline being December 28 as the last date in which all institutions could comment. There was a time period there.

Now, what is going to happen, is that the remainder of the alternative proposals that were allowed to be submitted up through mid-December as well as the proposals that currently were out there, they are all going to go out again for another time period. They are going to come back to the Management Council in April.

I hope, and I think what the group hopes, is that people do take them seriously and they will pay attention to the comments. There may be bits and pieces of a variety of proposals that people support or would not support. All of that will be considered in trying to decide whether it is appropriate to move one or parts of one or more of the proposals forward.

Ms. Potuto: Steve, can I interrupt?

Mr. Mallonee: Yes.

Ms. Potuto: How will we do that here for the Big 12 Conference in Nebraska? We are saying we like this piece of this proposal and this piece of this proposal and we would like them grouped. If we do, will that be out in time for the other institutions to take a look and see if they agree with the particular modification?

Mr. Mallonee: It will be hard. What will generally happen is each of the conferences will organize a manner in which they review

all of the proposals. Each of the conferences will submit its comment through the process to the Management Council, so hopefully your conference will organize something where you all have the opportunity to read some consensus of which of the proposals you support and parts of them. It will be up to the Management Council and, obviously the staff, to shepherd the comments and to organize them.

The other thing that poses some difficulty—and it has been raised here—is that some of the alternative proposals, depending on if they are approved or not, may render parts of other ones moot. It will be our responsibility to make sure that we order them properly and they are considered in the proper order by the Management Council if that happens.

Ms. Potuto: I guess you have not made me aware about the process, unless I missed something there and I have not heard correctly. I still don't see how... Let's say the Big Ten Conference decides to propose a piece of one proposal and a piece of another. They are set on that, and that is what their Management Council representatives were told.

The Management Council meeting in April is—and correct me if I am wrong—the final vote on these proposals. When will the Big 12 Conference have the opportunities as a conference to look at what the Big Ten has said and consider it?

If it is the representatives of the Management Council—if I understand the operation of the Management Council—in this task there may not be that much leeway in the representatives of the Management Council to respond differently from the direction that the conference had taken going in.

David Berst (NCAA Staff): I want to note that probably there are two ways. One is the conferences can communicate with each other as we go through the interim period. In the formal process, the agenda materials related to the Management Council meeting have to go out a month ahead of time.

So you are going to make the deadline to get it out. That is specifically for the purposes of getting that material to the conference offices for sharing and communicating them with the Management Council members who represent the Council. I think there are several opportunities to communicate with the Management Council.

Mr. Leland: In addition to that, Gene Smith at Iowa State is chairman of a subcommittee of the Management Council whose task it is to help us, all of us, particularly the Management Council, to shepherd these ideas through. I am sure if all else fails, you can talk to Gene. He will probably spend the next few months of his life on that. Gene Smith humbly volunteered for the job to shepherd this through.

Mr. Mallonee: The last thing I have to add to that, is that if the Management Council would support something in April, or a combination of something that increases the scope of what one of the original proposals is right now, it would be obligated in the process to

send that back out for comments.

As for your other question, your observation is correct. Under the draft of the legislation, there really wasn't an exception built in to address some of the things you did. It isn't a steadfast limit of four initial during any academic year.

Dennis Thomas (Samford University): What information was used to determine adding, meeting and maintaining the percentages in regard to the scholarships?

Mr. Knight: We had a compilation of graduation rates that the NCAA has published, that I can summarize fairly accurately. Of the 308 or so Division I schools in 1997, about 103 or 104 or 105 were graduating basketball players at a rate less than 30 percent. About 60 percent of the Division I basketball programs were graduating basketball players below 50 percent. As Chancellor Shaw has indicated, there was give and take in the discussion, and some people wanted thresholds established at different places. I think that the 33-percent threshold was established just because the other third of the schools are graduating a little more than 30 percent of the basketball players. The onus to be gained by graduating about 75 percent, the discussion there had to do with other parts of the package that we are talking about here.

If we are going to have an alternative compilation method that gives credit to the schools that have people who are leaving in good standing, then automatically the graduation rates will fit in the calculation. So the compromised position in the discussion was about three-quarters. That is very clear on this.

Dennis Thomas (Samford University): Did the committee give any consideration to graduation percentages below 32 percent in terms in reducing scholarships further?

Mr. Knight: I think the original proposal that came out of the subcommittee that proposed this had a further punishment and a further reward built into our initial proposal.

It did not deal with the graduations among the 30 percent and down, but it dealt with the time in which it was taking schools to make these graduation rates. If you were graduating less than 33 percent for a year, you lose a scholarship. If you continue at that level for another year, you lose a second scholarship. That was the original recommendation of the subcommittee, down to a floor of 11 scholarships. No one presented the idea to go below 11. Then if you were to reward good practices, you will continue to graduate basketball players and offer three-quarters for a second year. You would give 15 scholarships.

The prevailing sentiment in the working group was that the reward and punishment should be at the level of looking at less scholarships.

Jeffrey Orleans (The Ivy Group): This is a procedural question that goes back to the issue raised by our colleague from Nebraska. I wonder if the NCAA Web site couldn't be used so that if comments

come in electronic form they can be posted.

The Web site can basically be used as a way for people to see what other folks are thinking and submit their own comments and electronic dialogue without waiting for the distribution of materials and the compilation of materials. The staff did a great job with the Management Council in trying to collate all of this stuff. It is difficult to put it in the form that we need it for voting in April.

It is not difficult, I would hope, for people who have it in electronic form to communicate based on the materials that we have got. Let's talk with each other electronically in a public way on the Web site.

Robin Green (NCAA Staff): We do put the Management Council agenda materials on the Web site about 30 days before the meeting. Those materials will include a compilation of all the comments that are received and all of these proposals. So it will be available on the Web site in the membership section about 30 days prior to the meeting.

Jim Delany (Big Ten Conference): It strikes me that the advice that we can provide here in this forum and subsequently is all good. The Board will then hear from the Management Council, and that is all good.

But, you know, this is a major effort to reform, probably the most important reform efforts since we have reorganized the NCAA and allocated all the authority among the Board of Directors. My hope would be that the Board would listen to the advice from everyone and then do what it thinks it needs to do on behalf of the sport of men's basketball.

We have come through a long process to listen to everyone's point of view. As I think back to the early '90s, when the CEOs around the country felt as though we needed to make change, they put themselves in position to make that change. That was not a grass-roots effort by athletic directors and faculty and commissioners. It was really the CEOs deciding that change needed to happen in this organization.

Academic standards were increased and a number of other proposals were changed. I would hope the Board, after listening to the advice it gets from every segment of the organizations will go ahead and step forward and make the change it thinks is necessary to help insulate this sport from some pernicious effects.

With regard to No. 122-A, if there is a single element in this package that is important, I think it is 122-A. I think that everyone would be surprised to really understand and know how much movement or mobility there is among players after they reside at your colleges and universities. The NCAA does not track this. It is obvious that graduation rates are affected by the movement. I am sure we need to find newer and better ways to make the graduation rates better. In the sport of men's basketball in the Big Ten Conference, we found from 1990 to 1997 we had signed over 200 players at our institutions over

that seven or eight-year period. We had spent tens of thousands of dollars to recruit these people, put them on full aid.

More than half of them had left the institution prior to graduation. Seventy percent had transferred to other Division I or Division II institutions. Fifteen percent were missing in action and only 15 percent went to the NBA. So there is more movement and more mobility in Division I men's basketball than there is in the NBA, than there is with Major League Baseball and than there is in the NFL.

If we don't think this movement is a problem, we have got a problem. We will have to take a hard look at why this is occurring after the full aid is being provided and after a thorough recruitment process is undertaken. I think this one proposal will do as much as anything in the proposal to encourage our coaches to recruit players and to understand that there are various penalties to be paid for that amount of instability and mobility at your universities.

Mr. Leland: Thank you, Jim. I would mention that in terms of what Jim said, there are a substantial number of Board of Directors presidents here. I think it is clear they are listening.

Lloyd Hill (Alcorn State University): I realize that these proposals were sent to the membership in October. But I get a feeling that there is a rush to judgment on trying to make these things effective immediately.

It would appear to me that if it is going to the membership to have comments on it in April, you can put conferences in a position that is going to increase our budgets, and we will not have any opportunity to do anything about it.

All the proposals have some merit. It seems to me we should allow enough time so our basketball coaches and all the folks can have some input in this process. I simply get a feeling that this is being pushed on us a little too rapidly. I would like to see a little more deliberate look to see what is taking place here.

Courtney Cutchall (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I believe the question was very similar to what was just stated. Why, with such an important issue, are we trying to push it forward so fast? Obviously, it is just right now for basketball, but it probably will trickle down to the other sports and be a very important issue for all levels. We are just wondering why it is being pushed through at such a fast pace?

Mr. Leland: My job is not to defend the committee although I was a member of it. But let me say from a Management Council's perspective, as it relates to the Board of Directors, this initiative started over 20 months ago.

People have been working very busily and very hard on it for over a period of time. I think that we are caught between the competing desires of those who want significant change and those members of the Board of Directors, especially who really had envisioned this originally on a fast track than we have now had.

I think from their perspective, they would look at a request to

speed this up or slow this down. They have told us they have done that at one time. I think that what all of us need to do, as members of the NCAA, is to make sure when things are sent out that we follow-up. There has been adequate chance for input and there still remains adequate chances for input between now and then. I think that the Management Council is ready to not only listen but to work very hard to make sure that we ameliorate as many people's concerns as we possibly can.

My only real job here was to move this thing along. I happen to be the only failure in the room. We are not moving it along as quickly as we would like to. Given the priority that the Board and the Management Council has put on this issue, I will just rule from here that we will continue with the same pace, go through the next set of arguments.

Quite frankly, the turnout is a lot larger than we anticipated. I think the quality of the discussion has been absolutely what we wanted. I will, with your permission, alternate our time frame a little bit and take a little longer to make sure that we again thoroughly discuss some other remaining items.

Jim Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): Regarding the four-scholarship limit, when you go back to your campuses and talk to your coaches, I am sure in your own minds as you reflect on the signings in basketball and how many signings there have been, that we would all concur that sounds like a fairly reasonable figure.

We have heard discussion about student-athletes transferring. I think sometimes the inference is that coaches are running them off, and they don't leave on their own accord and for their own reason. The fact is that there are coaches who do request or influence kids to leave, but kids are also leaving on their own free will.

I think when you get back to the four-scholarship limit and when you look at what happens when there is a coaching change, you will note that there is a real transition period where the coach, the new coach and the student-athletes from that team were trying to come to some type of understanding as to what the future holds for those student-athletes in the programs—the coaches' play, the demeanor, where he comes from and his experience.

All of those things could impact the student-athlete as to whether he wants to remain in the program. When you go back on your campus and have dialogue with your coach, I think you will find some serious concerns expressed from them about this transition.

Of course, if you are talking to your coach and he is the one who is leaving, it probably doesn't affect him. But it affects your institution in terms of sustaining an ongoing program. I think that there are some additional exceptions or issues that need to be addressed.

In looking at the Big Ten and Southeastern Conference proposals, to add to the penalty for low graduation rates and tying it to team limits, I think what would run through my mind is that as you

increase the penalty, you also need to empower the student-athlete.

Ultimately, the coach cannot force the student-athlete to study. I do think that the coaches do, in fact, want their students to go to class. I think they track their student-athletes going to class. Many of you in this room have student-athlete support programs in huge buildings and millions of dollars to aid and help student-athletes to succeed.

I think one critical area—and I think if you got coaches together you could say that it's the biggest issue—affecting the student-athlete's status academically will be missed classes. But I think the point is that we do want our student-athletes to graduate, just as you expect the coach to find some way of absolutely guaranteeing without exception that that student-athlete is in class, then you will have to take into account the scheduling.

If you are going to put student-athletes on the road in the middle of the week where they are missing class, they are missing important lectures, they are missing important information they could be acquiring in the classroom.

If you look to increase the penalties that you are going to place on the program and the coach, then I think that you also have to look at empowering the student-athlete to be more successful and you have to look at missed class time. If the institution and the conference are requiring games in the middle of the week, then you are creating an obstacle for that student-athlete to overcome.

Mr. Leland: Thank you. Steve will now start the next section, which deals specifically with No. 99-128 and amendments.

Jim Delany (Big Ten Conference): I think your point is well taken. I just wondered if the NABC will support Friday and Saturday games only.

Mr. Haney: Jim, obviously, it is a shift. But, quite frankly, it will be worth talking about. Truly, I think that would be worth talking about. We have a lot of games being played Friday and Sunday.

Mr. Delany: Our coaches have never mentioned that. I will introduce that restriction.

Mr. Haney: That will be great.

Mr. Mallonee: The third set of proposals relate to the recruitment of men's basketball prospective student-athletes, and then we will look at several alternatives. The common theme you are going to see throughout these objectives is a desire to reduce or minimize the influence of the external nonscholastic factors in the recruiting process and to try to focus the process more on the academic year recruiting rather than the scholastic coaching.

The proposal that was developed by the working group is No. 99-128-A. It has several points that are worth providing some explanation on. First of all, it would permit a greater time period for conducting fall contacts. The 18 days would remain, but it would be within a 30-day period beginning the Thursday after Labor Day.

The proposal would establish a contact period during the acade-

mic year the Friday after the Final Four basketball tournament for nine days following the initial time for the signing of the National Letter of Intent in the sport.

The proposal would reduce the summer evaluation period that is currently 24 days to 14 days. It would be a flexible 14-day period as determined by the institution. It would increase the academic-year evaluation period. It is currently 40 evaluation days to 50.

It would also establish a 10-day evaluation period in late April or early May, from the Wednesday through the following Sunday, in which coaches would be able to visit high schools one time to evaluate and also during that time to have a limited contact or conversation with junior prospects in the presence of the high-school coach. The limited contact the group discussed would probably be more like a formal greeting and not to be a very long period of time, although it did not come up with a time period.

The final part of this proposal would permit a phone call to occur during a 10-day period possibly on the Monday following Mother's Day. This would not be an official telephone call. It would be one telephone call in lieu of the one that currently is permitted between June 21 and the end of July. That is the working group proposal.

There are several alternatives here. The first one is No. 99-128-B. It comes from both the Big Ten and the Southeastern Conference. It differs from the working group proposal in that it would eliminate entirely the summer evaluation period. It would eliminate evaluation from July 8 through July 31. It would increase the days during the academic year for evaluations from 40 to 70 and provide for a greater time period of about 35 days during the fall contact period in which to make contacts. Institutions would be permitted only to evaluate prospects in their regular-season activities in those events that have been approved or sponsored by the appropriate high-school or junior college association. It would not establish the 10-day evaluation period that the working group proposal would at the end of April or May to have limited contact with juniors. June 21 would remain the date for the initial telephone call. It would not add.

The third alternative, which comes from the Pac-10, differs from the working group in that it would eliminate early phone calls to prospects in both men's and women's basketball and actually would reinstate the July 1 date.

There was a June 21 date. It would reinstate the July 1 date as the earliest permissible date, and it also would eliminate limited contact during the 10-day period that is proposed in the working group proposal at the end of April and early May.

The next four proposals, which are Nos. 128-B through G, all really relate to the summer evaluation period. They provide alternatives to what the working group proposal had suggested in terms of summer evaluations. No. 128-B, which came from the Pac-10, would have a 14-day evaluation period similar to the working group proposal, but it would be a structured 14-day period. It would be seven days

between July 8 and the 14th, followed by seven days down time, and then seven more days at the end of the July period—the 25th through the 31st—in which to evaluate prospects.

No. 128-E, comes from the Northeast Conference. It would increase the number of days from 14 to 20. The working group's original proposal being 14, it again would structure them to be 10 at the beginning and 10 at the end, and then a quiet period from Friday through Monday over the weekend of the third week in July.

The last two proposals, which are F and G, both come from the Pac-10 and both provide alternatives. The first one is an 18-day alternative in July, nine days at the beginning followed by a six-day dead period, and then nine days at the end.

The last proposal is an eight-eight-eight approach—eight days of evaluation at the beginning, eight days for a dead period and eight days at the end. Those are the proposals that are out there that relate to that issue.

I will turn it over to Mike and Jim to make some additional comments.

Mike McGee (University of South Carolina, Columbia): Thank you, Steve. The Recruiting Subcommittee, as Chancellor Shaw indicated, really worked to a great extent as a committee of the whole.

The working group had the benefit of the breadth of input and observations and recommendations, but also significant input from various student-athletes at different levels of competitive success. We also had the opportunity to visit with the staff group at some length. Those conversations related mostly to the area of their greatest concern, which is the junior phone call and evaluation. I know the chair of that group is here and she can observe to what extent the discussions may have alleviated their concerns in those particular areas. Jim Haney and I will address several of the more noteworthy proposals, and we will be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Starting with summer evaluation, the subcommittee was cognizant of the competing interest among the various levels of Division I basketball as it relates to summer evaluation. We considered eliminating the summer evaluation totally, but given the critical importance of the summer period for fully two-thirds of the Division I institutions, and the concern expressed by those knowledgeable of the summer environment, to abandon the summer to nonscholastic coaches, agents, runners and commercial interests would not be in the best interest of prospective student-athletes.

We took the position that some reduction—a proverbial shot across the bow—would be in the best interest of not only the basketball programs, but clearly in the best interest of the student-athletes. It was also our observation that summer events and camps will continue with or without NCAA involvement. Jim Haney will speak further to that in a moment.

We recommended that through reducing summer evaluation days

from 24 to 14—approximately a 40-percent reduction—and strengthening the summer event and team NCAA certification process, which to this point, because of a lack of the commitment of resources, is somewhat meaningless. Including as one of the requirements full financial disclosure and working in conjunction with the high-school federation, we will address over a relatively short period of time the problem and limit the abuses that concerned us all.

Although we rejected at this time the notion to give up summer evaluation totally, included in our recommendation is an oversight process, and without significant improvement in eliminating the summer abuses, we would support action to eliminate summer recruiting. Further and importantly, the subcommittee responded to the needs as was expressed across the board, including very strongly from the high school federation and its constituent groups, the need to strengthen and in some cases reinvolve the high-school coaches, administrators and counselors in the recruiting process, along with the corresponding decrease in the impact of nonscholastic external influences upon the recruitment of basketball student-athletes throughout the year.

Major changes involving that were that all evaluations during the academic year would be limited to regularly scheduled high-school and two-year college events and activities under the supervision of those coaches. We believe this will be the major step in that process, creating a spring 10-day period for evaluation of juniors with the introduction of the prospective student-athlete and in the presence of the high-school coach to the college coach, and to permit one phone call between the prospective student-athlete and the college coach to determine interest both ways, and to obtain summer plans on the part of the prospective student-athlete.

I would remind you that this call and evaluation is not precedent setting since we have had for a period of five years similar provisions for football. It was observed that too often, the first communication was with a prospective student-athlete. It was not through the high-school process or scholastic process, but indeed through the non-scholastic coach.

We also recommended the corresponding 10-day increase in the academic year that matches with the reduction in the summer from 24 to 14 days. Now, Jim can pick up on these points.

Jim Haney (National Association of Basketball Coaches): Mike was very thorough in his presentation. I will just pick up on two points that he asked me to follow up on. One is in changing the landscape of basketball.

In the last six months, we have seen more and more focus on what the NBA may do in terms of a minor league basketball program, based on the number of high-school and underclassmen collegiate student-athletes who were departing for the NBA earlier. The NBA is becoming younger and younger, and it is trying to contemplate the possibility of some type of minor league.

The International Basketball League is now up and running. The Collegiate Professional League, based in New England, is also looking to attract high-school players and give them alternatives in the IBL. It is really a changing landscape. It was the feeling of the committee that we needed to have a presence there.

The second point I would make is that every year there are articles written—much discussion about the state of what is happening in the summer—that tend to focus on the elite prospects. I wanted to make mention that there are thousands of prospective student-athletes who are having an opportunity to compete in the summer and have wonderful experiences and have the opportunity to be viewed by the collegiate programs and collegiate coaches, and the opportunity to get a scholarship and not be a focal point of some of the problems and concerns that we focused on in summer basketball.

I think I will stop there, Ted.

Alan Hauser (Appalachian State University): We all clearly are very concerned with the need to assist and keep on track our student-athletes academically. I think that many of us would agree that the single most important person helping to do that is often the coach or the assistant coach under whom that student-athlete works.

I wonder if the committee discussed the fact that increasing from 40 to 50 the number of days that coaches can be off campus recruiting might have a negative effect on that?

Mr. McGee: The overall recruiting days, the consideration of maintaining that, was part of the shift. Although it does take two coaches instead of three in the summer who were permitted to travel during the evaluation days off of the campus, we considered that maintaining the total number was, in fact, of significant importance in maintaining that.

In fact, it is a reduction of 10 as far as the coaches being off campus. As I said, three are permitted to travel in the summer. But that is our response as far as it is related to that issue.

Tom Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I join the other speakers in commending the panel. You have done a great job in giving us much to consider. We favor structuring the July period so that all coaches are either in or out at the same time, and you don't have the 14 days floating.

We also favor giving the student-athletes who are prospects and who are playing in all these camps a break in the middle so they can get a chance to rest a bit in this long grind. We put in three different proposals, which go from 14 to 18 days, joined by the Northeast-10 for 20. That's how many days you want to be out and to give the structure because we think it would be beneficial for all parties concerned.

Mr. McGee: We considered that proposal, Tom, and would not be opposed to that kind of structuring. I think the important thing is that we do maintain some summer presence.

Roy Kramer (Southeastern Conference): I would like to make one observation first and then a comment. The observation is that

based on the history of this organization over the past year, I would strongly urge that every single one of these proposals be analyzed by the Council of the NCAA long before April.

I have voted on some of those other proposals in the past and I have taken my fair share. I would hope you people give us some legal opinions long before we come to a point of voting in April. I am just pointing to that statement.

The second is much stronger. It is my understanding that this committee was brought together to change the culture of college basketball. If that is the case, the issue will be, as someone told me recently, whether we rearrange the chairs on the deck of the Titanic and let it sink anyway, or rather we do something about the ship. If we are going to do something about the ship, we better do something strong. I believe in all of these issues that are out there. Some of them are very strong and very good and very positive. There are two that will change the culture of college basketball.

Now, the question is, do we have the guts to do it? Number one, is to limit the number of initial grants. We will totally change the structure of recruiting of college basketball. We can do the interpretations. We have got hundreds of people who we pay to do interpretations. We can interpret if you change something slightly to get an extra one. But we need not have an initial limit. When we have an initial limit, we will change the posture of how we recruit college basketball players. Instead of recruiting seven and eight a year, we will be recruiting four and we will be working to keep them in our program.

Number two, we will pass 128-B, and I realize I am in the vast minority here. I have been a commissioner for almost 11 years. I served on the Infractions Committee for 10 years. Now, 80 to 85 percent of all the violations we deal with in recruiting in college basketball start with the leeches and the parasites who have become a significant fabric of college basketball.

I don't care whether they are at the top level, the middle level or the bottom level. The issue is the sport of college basketball. If we have got enough courage to do something, we will eliminate summer recruiting. Then we will turn the sport around. Otherwise, we just rearrange the chairs.

The question is, do we pass a group of meaningless pieces of legislation that will make us look good in USA Today and higher education, or will we change the sport of basketball? Thank you.

Derita Ratcliffe (Eastern Kentucky University): I want to concur with the concerns of my colleague from Appalachian State University, particularly with regard to the elimination of the summer evaluation period and the opportunity for contact with coaches for our student-athletes in the academic year.

Unfortunately, all Division I institutions are not created equal. At Eastern Kentucky, for example, our coaches teach courses. That would be an increased burden in the recruiting process. I think we

need to look at the difference between our institutions when it comes to what our coaches are availed to during the academic year. Thank you.

Nigel Burton (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I applaud Mr. Kramer in his inspired dedication to student-athletes and in the support of college basketball.

As far as the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is concerned, I am still amazed that you have a recruiting calendar that proposes more contact periods and more calls and more invasion on the prospective student-athletes' lives.

Once again, if you notice, it always seems to be over the sports that are the high revenue. When the student-athletes' surveys come out, they are saying these telephone calls are intruding on my life.

The basketball working group, which has done an exemplary job of trying to address the academic concerns of student-athletes already in colleges, should look at the calendar and see how moving a contact period into right around the period of a prospective student-athlete's junior year is going to hurt them academically when they are dealing with phone calls, when they are trying to study.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we actually challenge ourselves to go back to our divisions and campuses to reevaluate all the early phone calls and moving dates forward. All the answers we got back is that student-athletes are coming up with stories of getting phone calls in their freshman and sophomore years accidentally and all kinds of things.

Yet, we are still doing that. So I guess I would actually look at 128-B as well and see that they are doing away with some of the earlier phone calls and trying to address some of the issues that Mr. Kramer and the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee have been talking about for years. The next time we discuss a recruiting calendar, which I am sure will come up, people will take a look at increasing phone calls with contacts in the major sports and realize what student-athletes have been talking about. The Council and committees have not been talking about this, and do not know what we are talking about.

These are the stories we are getting from all our student-athletes. I have gone through the recruiting process twice—once as a student-athlete coming out of high school and once as I played football for the University of Pacific. Twice, the same item. I had to leave the stadium because I was getting all these people following me with phone calls to friends' houses. This is an intrusion on our life. We really don't want it.

Mr. Leland: Thank you, Nigel. Here is what I would like to do. Steve has a quick power point on a couple of the other issues. We don't really have time right now to debate that. Then Chancellor Shaw would like to do some closing remarks. If you can just maintain your attention for another five or 10 minutes, I think we will have it complete.

Mr. Mallonee: Two other proposals that are probably worth at least providing some explanation that may help you in figuring out where you stand on them or possibly figure out your ballot. They are Nos. 99-124 and 99-125. Proposal 99-124 relates to continuing eligibility in basketball to student-athletes. The proposal developed by the working group is 124-A.

That would require, and we have touched upon this a little bit today, qualifiers successfully completing a minimum of 12 hours of degree credit during their first term of enrollment, no matter when that first term is. You achieve a 2.0 GPA in at least 12 hours of degree credit work.

There is an alternative proposal to that being suggested by the Big Ten that requires the GPA to be based on the conclusion at the first term of full-time enrollment, not just the best 12 hours of degree credit.

It also clarifies that it is permissive to use prerequisite hours in estimating the 12-credit hour requirement, which is the current requirement. That would apply to the working proposal also.

In 99-125, there are three proposals in that set that relate to eligibility of transfers. The first one coming from the working group relates to mid-year transfers and would basically impose a term, if you will, or maybe two quarters. But for mid-year transfers, including four-year transfers, the earliest they would be eligible for competition travel would be the next academic year, so there would be a mandatory residence requirement.

I think it is important to clarify that this would not supersede, in terms of four-year transfers, the one-year residence requirement that already exists. But some four-year transfer student-athletes might need exceptions, particularly the international student-athletes who sometime come over and need nonsponsored sport exceptions that will be bound by the one term of being eligible for competition and travel.

There are a couple of proposals or suggested alternatives that have been submitted by the Pac-10 Conference. No. 125-B differs from the working group in that it would permit two-year college transfers who are qualifiers and who meet the applicable transfer requirements to be eligible immediately, but it also would require all two-year college transfer students who are not qualifiers to spend an automatic academic year in residence in the sport of basketball.

No. 125-C offers another alternative from the Pac-10 that would simply require all two-year college transfers in the sport of basketball to satisfy the academic year of residence. These are a couple of the remaining proposals that are worth looking at.

Mr. Leland: I would be remiss if I didn't thank Steve for pulling all this together. I think all of you who know me well and know my grasp of the issues know how Steve has benefitted from my personal tutoring on legislation. (Laughter) He seems to be getting better all the time.

We have Delise O'Meally who is here to do the power point and work with Steve. Give them both applause, please. (Applause)

Mr. Shaw: And kudos to you, Ed, for the leadership you have shown this morning. Here you have it. You have the presentations. I think we have had a very, very good discussion and some comments suggest ways that we can improve a package that I think and I hope that we can all accept in the last analysis.

I would reiterate for those of you who think you have a better way, after hearing the proposals and the various alternatives, please think them through. Please provide those recommendations to the Management Council. I ask that you consider not only if this is in the best interest of basketball, but secondly, will our membership endorse it?

I strongly believe that we want and need substantive change. However, what we don't need is to tilt at windmills for another couple of years only to conclude that if we had done it right, we could have got the job done. We need to get the job done now.

Whatever we come up with in April will be imperfect. We can almost guarantee that. It will be imperfect because we are imperfect people in an imperfect world.

I can speak for a moment to Jim Delany's comments. I think he made an excellent statement when he said in the last analysis under the new governance structure it is the Board of Directors that will have to deal with this.

Speaking as one member of that group, we will be fully prepared to do what we are supposed to do. Thanks for your input and thanks for your serious interest in a very important conversation and topic. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Leland: We will recess and we will reconvene at 10:45 to discuss amateurism.

AMATEURISM FORUM

Mr. Leland: We will begin at this time. I would like to again introduce myself. My name is Ted Leland. I am director of athletics and recreation at Stanford University and also chair of the NCAA Division I Management Council.

Let me begin by introducing the head table. Again, my task is to move along the discussion and try to get as much input as I can regarding a series of proposals that affect preenrollment eligibility. If we had a good and lively discussion about the ramifications of some of the proposals of the basketball working group, we should at least have as good and lively of a discussion regarding these topics. I think that we are looking at student-athletes' welfare and what is best for college athletics. These proposals are at least as exciting and revolutionary or disturbing as any I have looked at as those others.

Let me introduce the head table. On my right and to your left is David Knight, professor of chemistry and chair of the Academic and Eligibility Cabinet. He also is a consultant to the Board of Directors

on continuing-eligibility issues and past chair of the faculty rep association. Bill Saum, who is to your far left and my right is a staff member of the NCAA and director of agents and gambling. He has worked for the NCAA for about 10 years and was a football coach before coming to the NCAA. Lisa Dehon, who is second to my right, has just left the NCAA after being on the staff for eight or nine years. She has made the decision to stay in Kansas City, but is still helping us through these issues as a consultant. She was the liaison to the Amateurism and Agents Subcommittee of the Academics and Eligibility Cabinet. To my right, is a colleague of mine for many years, one who was a former staff member with the NCAA, Commissioner Tom Hansen. He is chair of one of the Ad Hoc Committees on Amateurism and Agents. Lyman Porter, to my left, is the faculty athletics representative of the University of California, Irvine. He also is a member of the Agents and Amateurism Subcommittee of the AEC, and professor of management at UC Irvine. To the far right is Sandra Norrell-Thomas, vice-president for student affairs and senior woman administrator at Howard University. She has been on the NCAA Council and was a volunteer on the management structure of the NCAA for over 10 years. She has done all kinds of things to serve student-athletes and presently is on the Agents and Amateurism Subcommittee of the AEC. Over to my left in the middle, is Julie Roe-Sumner, director of student-athlete reinstatement, a position that really puts her on the firing line for the NCAA staff as it deals with these amateurism issues. Christine Grant sends her apologies. All of us who have been involved in college athletics for a long time have known and admired Christine and the wonderful work she has done. Her heart and soul is clearly with this project. She had a family emergency that called her away, so we asked David Knight, in addition to all the other things he has done on behalf of student-athletes, to step in and give an introductory talk here.

Then we will have a power-point demonstration again. I will spend about 15 minutes asking what we think are some of the tougher questions of the committee and of the staff involved in this. Then we will try to open it up with a goal of getting done by 11:45. Thank you for your attention again.

David Knight (University of North Carolina, Greensboro): Thank you, Ted. Let's give Christine our thoughts. She is such a valuable colleague for us. When the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet was formed, numerous administrative tasks in the previous governance system were centralized in the cabinet and this included the area of agents and amateurism and their impacts on various aspects of financial aid.

The importance of these topics was recognized and the Amateurism and Agents Subcommittee of the cabinet was formed as a permanent standing committee of the cabinet. The Amateurism and Agents Subcommittee has been studying these issues for over

two years and has proposed the deregulation package that is before you.

In our October meeting, the cabinets endorsed these proposals and sent them forward to the Management Council. We now have the opportunity to discuss them. Where does the initiative for this study come from? The initiative for this in-depth study comes from several sources.

In recent years, athletes in many sports have increasingly taken part in organized competition during high school and in the interval between high-school graduation and initial enrollment in college. This has put pressure on the application of our current amateurism award.

It has revealed apparent inconsistencies in their application. Some athletes have permanently lost NCAA eligibility for taking part in certain activities while others who acted similarly are immediately eligible for four years of eligibility. These apparent inconsistencies were due in large part to the real difficulties that we have under our present rules of determining whether an individual is truly an amateur or is a professional. The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee has been increasingly busy with a variety of labor requests on this topic.

One reason why this study is being done is to make the applications of our rules more consistent, because it is clear that the membership wants this consistency improved. Part of the impetus for this study also comes from the desire to continue work in this area begun in the previous governance system.

The Board of Directors conducted a survey of Division I presidents, and the presidents indicated their desire to deal with that topic. In addition, our president, Cedric Dempsey, has identified the study of amateurism as one of the key initiatives of his administration. These proposals, if enacted, represent a break from our previous regulations and for some, like scotch, will be an acquired taste. The whole issue is complex. The committee would like to point out some simplifying ideas that can provide focus for our discussion.

First, the current proposals deal only with prospective student-athletes prior to their initial enrollment in college. As our discussion gets rolling, sometimes it is hard to keep that in mind. Second, even if there is deregulation of the preenrollment amateurism rules, that does not imply that the postenrollment rules would be similarly deregulated. Third, the current proposals are based on two of the most important core values of our Association: welfare of student-athletes—in this particular case that would be prospective student-athletes—and the value of competitive equity.

Much of the difficulty with immediate acceptance of these proposals lie with the contention inherent between the core values. We are inclined to agree with proposals that clearly serve the individual well, but we are very leery of upsetting competitive equity. By this, I mean permitting unfair advantage. We are aware that these propos-

als are problematic to some individuals. We would ask you to remember that the Amateurism and Agents Subcommittee is a standing committee and will continue its work into the future.

The discussion we have will be very useful in instructing the subcommittee in its future deliberations, and we would appreciate hearing your alternative ideas.

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Staff): I will take you through a quick overview of what the deregulation proposals are. The session overview will go through the expansion of Bylaw 14.2.4.2—prize money grants, signing of contracts, competition with professionals and pay for play.

The subcommittee attempted to look at Bylaw 12 with a fresh look, trying not to continually be tied to the notion that we have held in the past. When they looked at Bylaw 12 with a fresh look, there were two things that continually seemed to drop out from their discussion—what is best for the athlete and competitive equity? Dealing with competitive equity and asking what leads to an actual competitive advantage, there is really only one answer—actual competition. The only thing that lends to it is a competitive advantage. We have current legislation that addresses any competitive advantage in the sport of tennis, and the subcommittee has looked at expanding this piece of legislation to all sports.

Under this legislation, a student-athlete or prospect has one year from the date of high-school graduation to enroll and retain four years of eligibility and be immediately eligible. That means if they competed in organized competition during that one-year period, it does not affect the number of seasons of competition that they will be given. Assuming that they are initially eligible, they will be able to compete right away.

Now, if a prospect competes outside of what we call that one-year grace period, then they are charged with a season of competition for every year they compete beyond that one-year period. Also, upon their initial enrollment, they have to fulfill an academic year in residence.

An example of this would be if a prospect competes for two years after high-school graduation, then they decide to leave, they will lose one season of competition and must fulfill an academic year in residence before they can compete in the next three seasons they have coming to them.

This was the initial proposal put forth by the subcommittee. However, due to the results of numerous educational seminars that were put on for individuals and the comments that were coming back, it became clear that the membership was interested in getting rid of the grace period.

Therefore, we have an alternative proposal that will also be put forth. In fact, this is the proposal that the subcommittee is supporting. Again, this proposal gets rid of that one-year grace period. The way this works is that at the conclusion of the summer following

high-school graduation, the prospect engages in organized competition, then they are charged with the loss of a season of competition for every year that they compete and they must fill an academic year in residence.

Using the same example, if that same prospect competes in two years of competition after high-school graduation, upon initial enrollment, they will only have five years in which to compete and only two seasons of competition after fulfilling their academic year in residence.

The subcommittee likes this proposal for many reasons. One is that it directly addresses any competitive advantage that can be gained through competition. Also, the academic year in residence that must be fulfilled shows a commitment to academics on the part of both institutions and on the part of the prospect.

If they are willing to forego those advantages that may be given to them if we deregulate other portions of Bylaw 12, and they decide to initially enroll and they are willing to fulfill that academic year in residence and maintain satisfactory progress, then we take the commitment on their part as the type of prospective student-athlete we would want in our program.

The first issue that we talked about is the subcommittee's issue of prize money. We chose this topic because prize money or money is so intertwined in our definition of amateurism, and we wanted to see if we could get over the hump and look at it in a different way.

I will share with you two case scenarios that really brought clarity to the subcommittee's evaluation of money in amateurism. The first was a 15-year-old swimmer who competed in the 1996 Olympics and was eligible to receive \$80,000 through the Operation Gold swimming program based on place finish in the Olympics.

This particular young woman—it was very expensive to be a swimmer at that level and her parents had spent a great deal of money. They were unable to pass up \$80,000 and decided to accept it. We have had no reinstatement request on behalf of this young woman and we really don't anticipate that we would, because if she needed to accept it, it is unlikely she would be able to repay the money in order to regain her eligibility. In the next scenario, a 14-year-old in the same Olympics was able to decline the \$80,000 in prize money. Her financial situation was a little bit different. To our knowledge, she is now attending an institution this fall. These prospects would bring the same element to an institution if they were both to enroll. They both had the same coaching, the state of New York facilities in training, and the same extensive competition against international and national competitors. It all rests on the ability to repay, which leads to an inconsistent result.

Repayment is a typical requirement in prize money cases. The subcommittee has looked at the "flow of money," if that makes sense. The flow of money means if a prospect gets money, he or she becomes a professional and then there is the magical thing that happens. If

you repay the money, it somehow addresses all the things that you may have gained through that competition, and you are now able to be reinstated.

Obviously, if someone is able to accept prize money, it may mean they are able to compete for an extended period of time after high school. If this occurred again, we go back to the application of 14.2.4.2, and we address any competitive advantages that they gained through the application of that legislation.

The next area is drafts and contracts. This area involves the same issues as prize money in that the subcommittee concluded there is nothing in being drafted or signing a contract that gives you an outright competitive advantage.

We will review three cases to show the application of current legislation. In the first case, the prospect places his name on the National Hockey League draft list. He was not drafted, he did not get a contract, yet he was reinstated after being withheld from two seasons and charged with the loss of two seasons.

In the next case, an individual signed a minor league contract to play professional baseball and withdrew from the team after four practices. He never competed and he never received any compensation. This individual was not reinstated. The old standard of review or the current standard of review is intent to professionalize. We are able to show this professionalism by engaging in these activities.

The next case is signing a player's contract for a minor league team. In one month, he was released for a preexisting injury and did not receive any compensation. His eligibility was not reinstated. These cases illustrate two points.

One is that none of these prospects gained a competitive advantage. They never actually competed for any of these teams. It also shows the very significant conditions for reinstatement that can be imposed. In one case, losing two seasons and in the other two cases, not being reinstated at all and never being able to play intercollegiate athletics.

The second point is the inconsistency in the application of the current standards and intent to professionalize. In some other sport systems, it is very difficult to be able to assess the intent of an individual. You see that some people who put their names in the draft were able to have some eligibility come back to them.

Of course, for some of the same things for signing a contract, others lost all of their eligibility because we were able to show a clear intent that they signed a major league contract in the United States. The question with the draft and signing of contracts is does it affect equity?

There are two general concerns we would have. One would be competitive advantage that is gained. If that is to be our focus, we cite Bylaw 14.2.4.2 to look at what competition they engaged in after high-school graduation. We find in that bylaw that they would sit a year and then lose whatever season of competition would be appropriate.

The next area is a little bit more difficult to get through because it deals with an issue that does directly give someone a competitive advantage. We will look at one actual case to show how the current legislation applies.

This individual participated in a professional tennis tournament. They registered as a professional. I am not sure if they were aware that they registered as a professional or amateur in tennis. But their expenses for traveling and competing for these prize monies may have gained them a competitive advantage. This individual was not reinstated.

What is interesting about this is that this prospect would have been okay. They would have had to repay the prize money, but they would have perhaps had four years of eligibility coming to them if they had simply checked a different box as an amateur.

That is how it is in determining amateur and professional status. Somehow, the signing of a different box on the form changes what you are and sometimes changes the actual competition. This was one of those cases that shows the inconsistency in the application of the current legislation.

Keeping that previous case in mind, this person did actually compete in organized competition. So we go back to the application of Bylaw 14.2.4.2 to draft any competitive advantage. So this individual would have eligibility included for athletic ability, but not as much as four years. But we would be able to bring him back into our program.

Another difficult area is acceptance of pay or compensation other than prize money. This would be in the form of salaries, stipends, educational grants or any of those forms that you may be able to think of. The subcommittee recognizes this is more difficult, but it still held to its analysis of prize money in that it is not the receipt of pay itself that lends itself to the competitive advantage. Instead, it is the actual competition.

Obviously, if you are receiving pay for play, you are most likely playing and you are competing, so again we go back to Bylaw 14.2.4.2 to address any competitive advantage that may have been gained by that actual competition.

With that, I will turn it back to Ted.

Mr. Leland: In my preliminary discussions with the subcommittee, I formulated some questions that I would like to pose that may anticipate some questions you might have. We asked these four questions and got a response from different committee members. Then we will open it up for questions.

My first question on behalf of all of you is why are we here? How did the issue of the application of our current amateurism legislation become a concern and how many of these types of evaluations and decisions that we saw here do we have to make on an annual basis?

Lyman Porter (University of California, Irvine): Let me try to provide a brief answer to that, Ted. David Knight has already used

some of that in his opening statement, so I don't want to review that history. Just to remind you, the AEC Cabinet has four standing subcommittees. When the cabinet was formed several years ago, some of us got put on that committee, not necessarily by choice, but we ended up on that subcommittee. I think that those of us who have been on it since then have thought that we were really dealing with some fundamental issues that turned out to be more than we anticipated.

As our subcommittee began to look at the issue of amateurism, we decided to focus on the fundamentals. There were various statements in the NCAA Manual about amateurism and we decided that we were going to try to keep our focus on the basic issues that needed attention. So we started in a sense—if I could make an analogy to the budgeting area—with what we call “zero-based budgeting.” We started from scratch as if there was nothing prior going on. We looked at going forward and what made the most sense.

That is the first point I want to make. We started with no preconceptions on the subcommittee. We felt that all of the regulations and interpretations related to amateurism needed attention. We started from level ground, so to speak.

Secondly, the subcommittee was informed over the next couple of years about all of the different reinstatement cases. The number of those reinstatement cases and the complexities related to comparing the situation from one country to another is difficult. Other countries don't have intercollegiate athletics like we do in the United States.

There are inconsistencies on how we treat foreign student cases from U.S. cases. So we were informed by a lot of the evidence about the difficulties of interpreting the current regulations. These were the ground rules. We wanted to focus on that. Clearly, there was a problem.

Mr. Leland: Thank you, Lyman. I neglected to mention that you have a paper at your chair that you can take with you. I should apologize for this. I should have disposed of this at the beginning. The legislation that relates to this initiative is at least six months behind where the legislation that dealt with the last basketball issue. In other words, the Management Council intends to do a preliminary review of specific proposals regarding amateurism at its April meeting if it so chooses. If it so chooses, it could pass those on a preliminary basis and put them out for comment.

But the earliest the Management Council would act on this and the very earliest the Board would act on this is in October of 2000. So we are a little bit further behind. That is why you are seeing this in a nebulous state. We're trying to lay out a set of issues as opposed to specific legislation. The committee will come back with specific legislation.

My second question for the committee is that I understand the subcommittee believes that the proposed legislation should be applied initially to all sports. The concerns I have heard is that there are specific problems with a specific sport—namely basketball. How

can these specific-sports concerns be addressed?

Tom Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): The answer the committee would have — you stole my speech, Mr. Leland—is that these are at a very early stage. Since we have learned about the basketball issues, it was too far down the track for membership input. The reason we are before you today is to generate input.

We realize that a lot of these proposals are even newer than the basketball proposals. The subcommittee and the academic cabinet are meeting in February before the Management Council meets in April. As Ted said, this is a long, long way before it goes to the Board.

We haven't, as has been mentioned, but I want to repeat, talked about the postenrollment and I don't think we have addressed the subject of agents whatsoever. As one who has seen that up close and personal, I don't know that there is any answer to that, no matter how many years we spend on that subject.

Answer number one to the question is we are still a long ways away. We are soliciting input. Christine Grant has been tireless in traveling to all types of meetings. At every meeting I have been at, she has been there and trying to give you the reason behind this.

As was stated, particularly by Lisa, we have found that there are problems in amateurism rules in every sport, and serious problems. The subcommittee has been moved by the fact that you keep sending in restoration requests for your student-athletes.

You are not content with the way the rules are now. That is another reason why we have reacted with these proposed changes. We have plenty of time to work with the specific sports groups and specific sports concerns. We welcome those and we certainly will undertake those.

I was a latecomer to this. I am not actually on the academics cabinet. Journalism majors don't qualify for that august body. I joined it to provide, along with Andy Geiger, more Division I-A input because it didn't have any on that particular subcommittee. When I arrived, much of the groundwork had been laid, thanks to Christine, Lyman and those who were on the subcommittee. I found it very hard to say, “but if you do that, isn't this going to happen?” You need to keep in mind the tennis rule, which is 14.2.4.2 that we talked about, where if you go out and have these outside competitions, then you begin to be penalized in the athletic career in college in a corresponding manner. You don't come in as a 25-year-old post-professional player as a true freshman. That is not going to happen.

So we believe that is the answer to many of the concerns that came up in our meetings and will come up when all of you discuss these proposals.

Sondra Norrell-Thomas (Howard University): I just want to add that for two years we listened to a lot of presidents talk to us about disassociation from the sport. Most of us were not interested in hearing that.

But as you began to listen to the treatment that was given to the

student-athletes, we had to have an open mind and we saw that some changes needed to be made. One of the things that was so convincing for me was that we separated this and only talked about the pre-enrollment area of this. It gave me an opportunity to see that someone out there thought that they were good enough to be able to go into professional sports, and we found out that it was not the case. It gave them an opportunity to come back and get a chance at an education. So that was participation and an education that they could come back to. This is something we had not been able to give them before. So that is what opened my mind, that we could educate more people.

Mr. Leland: Here is my third question. The subcommittee has made a lot of presentations to the Board, cabinet, Management Council, a number of coaching and other professional groups. What has been your experiences in presenting these ideas and what has been the biggest objections or concerns?

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Staff): We have spoken to many, many groups on two levels. One level was to educate about the work of the subcommittee and to get a sense if we are going in the right direction. Also, we'd ask if there were any alternative ideas that we can take back with us to help us bring back a better product. Our experiences have been primarily positive. Usually, what we find before the presentation is kind of a general fear of change and not understanding why we are needing the change. That is some of the concern at the outset. Generally, after the presentation we will have very extensive conversations that are very productive and very good. We seem to have at least opened up people's minds, even if we have not necessarily brought them over to our side completely.

One of the biggest concerns that we always heard about was the grace period in Bylaw 14.2.4.2, that the various sports felt that this perhaps opened up an area where individuals could come in and use that one year and really give the prospect some significant competitive advantage just within one year. So it was based on that kind of thinking that we wrote it taking out that grace period.

Another concern that we hear generally expressed is that somehow this legislation encourages prospects to pursue other endeavors rather than going to college and pursuing education. What we find when we look at the multitude of reinstatement cases is what actually is going to happen—that this primarily is going to open the door to prospects who have previously been excluded from pursuing a college education in intercollegiate athletics. They are going to be able to have some eligibility, and we are opening doors rather than encouraging an individual to go out and pursue other endeavors. Those individuals who have a great talent and a great skill to go out there as a professional are already doing it today.

Those individuals are a very, very small minority of prospects. It is very unlikely that those individuals will really want to come back and give up the money or give up the professional career to sit a year

and then play a limited amount of time in college.

One of the other secondary concerns that we heard about is the amount of money that is out there. There was concern that there was this great amount of money that they could be able to get and then go to college. We have never been able to really understand the substantive amount of money that would necessarily be a concern. Generally, in the cases of reinstatement fees, we are dealing with very small sums of money. We usually don't see high dollar amounts. The vast majority of prospects will be engaging in endeavors that bring about a small amount of money. Again, if they compete for any period of time, we would like to see 14.2.4.2. Those are generally the concerns that we have had specified to us.

Mr. Leland: Thank you, Lisa. The subcommittee appears to move for evaluation of amateurism based on monetary concerns to an evaluation of whether the kid has gained a competitive advantage in his or her athletics career or what they bring to the university.

Is this change there? Is that true what I just said? If so, how did the committee get to that point?

Lyman Porter (University of California, Irvine): I think a fundamental issue that we looked at was related to by our president, Ced Dempsey. To what extent, if any, should the NBA be trying to regulate the activities of students before they enroll in our universities other than, obviously, their academic performance?

Essentially, we decided as a subcommittee that it is not the situation that we are facing. Our focus was on as long as it did not disturb or in some way engage someone in an unfair competitive advantage. Therefore, we decided that money was in a sense a side issue. The issue was if any competitive advantage was being gained and how would that affect competition once the student was first enrolled. That is dealt with repeatedly by 14.2.4.2. So we focused simply on the question of why should we try to regulate anything other than the issue of gaining an unfair advantage?

Basically, what we are proposing is going to be easier to administer. It is going to be more fair to the prospective student-athlete. In my view, it will be fair to our own institutions because I think that it eliminates a lot of game playing that now goes on with all the requests for reinstatement. It has been very hard to maintain consistency with all of those requests.

Mr. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): I think we have to take a look at the rules now and how hard they are to administer, how inconsistent they are and how completely contradictory they are with what the rest of the world is doing; what the United States Olympic Committee and the federations are doing.

To me, when I saw some of these cases of individual student-athletes, it was tragic. Also, to just reiterate a point that Lyman made, it doesn't seem to me that if two institutions are recruiting the student-athlete, what difference does it make if that student-athlete tried for a summer to play professional baseball and failed to succeed

and now wants to play college baseball?

There is no competitive advantage gained by either of the institutions or several institutions in trying to recruit the student-athlete.

Mr. Leland: Now, we will open it up for questions. Go to the microphone if you have any questions or comments.

James Castaneda (Rice University): I'm a member of the AEC Cabinet. I have been involved as a spectator and as a participant in the discussions at the cabinet level.

I must say there are a couple of personal concerns that I have. When I hear that we are interested in student welfare and also in competitive equity, and when I hear that the small amounts of money that are currently in play are not amounts that should cause us concern, one of my concerns is if we do allow to pay for play-finish, that this could alter dramatically the whole recruiting scene.

There could be lots of tournaments and competitions arranged that would be on an invitational basis. The top student-athletes would be invited to be there and the control in some way could be handled by institutions.

A second concern I have is that we talked about preenrollment and postenrollment as if there is no connection. I personally feel that just as Bylaw 14.2.4.2, the tennis rule, is now being proposed for all sports, that there is a tendency and a very natural tendency once the train gets moving to keep it going in the same direction.

I certainly feel that there are certain things that I might be convinced to vote for in a preenrollment standard. I would not want to vote for a postenrollment standard. I wonder simply, and this is partly a concern and partly a question, is it fair to say on the part of the committee that even though your work so far has been in the preenrollment area that it would not be a normal sequence or normal tendency to go ahead into the postenrollment period?

I will finish with one general statement. I am pleased with the attendance here today, but it is far from representative of all of Division I. I know that in the restructured NCAA there is a great and widespread sense of disenfranchisement out there among all of the members. I know that there has even been a policy statement for this committee appearing before different groups and talking to different groups trying to convince them. Having been a member of one of these groups, I have been partially convinced by what I have heard.

If we are talking about April and October as the target dates for different points in this procedure, I really would like to ask what is the plan to get information like this out beyond the groups? The groups do not involve all NCAA members. What is the procedure? What is the proposal for disseminating all of this information to the total membership?

Amateurism is a cherished concept for the NCAA and for the individual members and for the members collectively. I think that what is being proposed may not strike us as being privy to all of these discussions as radical a change as it would obviously be for most of

the membership.

I simply hope that with our targets of April and October, that there is something in place that will get this out to the entire membership. I think that they deserve it.

Mr. Leland: That is great. I think I heard three questions. Tom, do you have these sorted out?

Bill Saum (NCAA Staff): Let's take the third question first in regards to the strategic plan. Lisa is going to answer that. Let me preface Lisa's answer by saying that Mr. Dempsey appointed a number of "initiative committees" after the most recent Executive Committee meeting. One of those initiative committees had to do with amateurism. That amateurism initiative committee was charged with coming up with a strategic plan for our deregulation of any number of issues, but also with what the subcommittee is doing. So there is a specific plan of action in place. Lisa will talk about that.

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Staff): This is going to take the same track that all legislation does involving the membership because we are aware of all of the legislation before the Management Council. You will have the opportunity during the comment period to bring your comments back to that body.

We have up until this point been committed to educating as many people as possible. We plan to continue that. We have bantered about a lot of things that we can do in sending packets to the schools. We would love to give part of the packet we prepared for you today to as many people as possible, if you know of individuals who would like to have that.

There was another issue that was brought up in pre- and post-enrollment. With preenrollment, we showed you the things that we used that were in the best interest of the student-athletes and competitive equity. The subcommittee had the conversation about what sort of things do we have proposed for postenrollment?

Those things do change. We realize those are now on our campuses and that we are able to regulate and monitor them in different ways what they do and perhaps more appropriate ways to do so in those cases. Some of the additional values that we talked about are a commitment to academics, our responsibility to the institution, the student-athlete and the student-athlete's responsibilities back to the institution, the interest of the team, and the interest of the institution.

It has become clear to us that if you bring in all of those values, the types of deregulation that you see in postenrollment are very likely to be different than the preenrollment because there are different interests involved with that. I think we would imagine, and it is our belief, that you would not see in a postenrollment period the same type and extent of change that you would see in preenrollment.

You may see some additional deregulation, but they are going to be holding those values that I told you about. I think that for the subcommittee, that brings some level of comfort; that those are the val-

ues they are going to use. I think it will result in different sources of deregulation over that period.

Mr. Saum: For several other plans and issues in the strategic plan, we will continue with some editorials in The NCAA News. You can find amateurism deregulation on the Web. We will have articles on amateurism in The NCAA News. We will add the "FAQs" that appeared in your booklet into The NCAA News.

We will continue to attend various committee meetings—such as the Olympic Sports Liaison, Women's Athletics Committee and Minority Opportunities and Interests and continue to communicate in that fashion. We will continue to communicate with the CCA and our president will send correspondence to our Division I presidents in this regard. Those are just a few of the specific items in the strategic plan.

Mr. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): For the last question, Jim, the subcommittee shared your concern about outside groups—the shoe companies of the world, so to speak—having influence. We have proposed an expansion or a strengthening of the athlete's interests.

Legislation is clear that an organization, commercial or otherwise, could access a recruiter on behalf of an institution. It is a rep just as an individual would be a rep.

Lyman Porter (University of California, Irvine): I just wanted to comment on Jim's appropriate concern about what we might do here eventually on the Association's behalf to what we are proposing for preenrollment. Will that determine the changes that are to be made in postenrollment?

My analysis, Jim, is that I don't think that we are on some public float that if we pass the proposed preenrollment legislation, that this somehow locks us into taking certain positions on postenrollment. I just think there is really nothing here that we would do in passing this that would somehow determine one way or the other what is done in postenrollment.

I, myself, have become a committed dove on preenrollment, but I remain a vigilant hawk on postenrollment. I really don't think that we are doing something that will somehow restrict our freedom in the postenrollment in terms of whatever changes we might or might not want to make.

Mike McGee (University of South Carolina, Columbia): I would like to make just a couple of quick comments and then ask a question. It seems to me that this legislation encourages stomping out a year with little in the way of consequences.

One would question whether this is in the best academic interest from high school to college life. Another concern is that high-school students will set their sights on post-high-school professional opportunities as we see time after time that it does at the tail end of the college experience and influence high-school academic performance.

I don't think we should try to compare tennis with the potential for problems and abuses in other sports. It is a long way from tennis

to the potential money, agents and problems that are associated in basketball, hockey and other sports with the nefarious influences that we see.

We talked a little earlier about the problems of agents and those interests that are created in the summer. That clearly is opening the door for tremendous abuse. It seems to me that in dealing with the whole issue of consequences in this decision, that if we looked at a one-for-one loss of eligibility—I know the committee had some discussions relating to that—but if we looked at a one-for-one loss of years of eligibility, which also clearly relates to current consequences for NCAA violations, that this would at least tend to address these problems.

Mr. Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): Mike, on your second point, the committee agrees with you after the trips that it has made to meet with different groups. The recommendation of the committee now is not to have the one-year grace period. I think you have made an important point and the committee is in agreement.

Julie Roe-Sumner (NCAA Staff): Also, in response to applying the tennis rule to all sports, the subcommittee has determined that deregulation should occur in all sports. The failed professional scenario that Lisa reviewed in a couple of cases and precedents, we see those in the sports of baseball, soccer, tennis and basketball. We are seeing an increasing number of those failed professionals.

Right now, they have no option because they are failed professionals and they show that intent to professionalize.

Joe Bertagna (American Hockey Association): It seems that the term "organized competition" covers all kinds of competition. Some have been previously considered professional and there are some who were not.

The phrase "opening doors" probably applies in our sport to a kid who plays junior hockey in Canada. He will now have more choices that he can choose in college before they were professional. There are also a lot of American families who have 17- or 18-year-old high-school graduates who have the choice of playing junior high hockey in the United States, which was always amateur hockey and not professional.

For those families, they have lots of choices. They no longer now have the choice to stay in their home, stay in the United States and play a year and get maturity. So I guess we have a concern that we have some choices that have been taken away from families without much input from our constituency.

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Staff): With the organized competition concerns that you have raised, we have looked at it. Actually, Division II has been at the forefront of putting together a definition of organized competition that would be applicable only to 14.2.4.2. It would be different than covered in the rule book. We have brought that to Division I to consider doing something like that to define organized competition in a different way. That is something that the committee

is looking at.

Also, if there are specific concerns regarding the impact that this legislation would have within the individual sports—I understand your concern is with U.S. Hockey and Hockey East—then certainly any specific concerns the subcommittee believes can be addressed on an as-needed basis.

First of all, it is important to get the fundamental legislation applied to all sports so we can keep it simple and keep it consistent. Then, as actual concerns do arise, we will deal with those in a pragmatic manner.

So we understand your concern and we are discussing that as a subcommittee. There is certainly nothing stopping any specific sport from putting forth its own proposal to deal with the concern they have regarding deregulation. Obviously, that will come to the subcommittee and we would assist that sport in any way in looking at that issue.

So there are avenues by which we can tweak this list of legislation as those concerns do actually arise so we can make it the best it can be.

Bill Saum (NCAA Staff): Christine Grant sent us marching orders for our meeting in February, which just yesterday we extended to a third day. We need your specific thoughts, via e-mail, voice mail or letter, so we can get it in front of Tom, Lyman, Sondra and Christine, and discuss them in February. There is still plenty of time.

Paul Baker (University of Miami, Florida): We have talked this morning and in earlier sessions about graduation rates, yet this system seems doomed to failure. If you bring a student back after not even giving him the first year, they will never be able to effectively complete their eligibility in time to graduate. I was curious about how you were going to address the issue of allowing people to complete their graduation.

The second issue that has not been addressed is agents. There will be two groups of students, or two groups of professional athletes—one who will have agents and one who doesn't because they will be expecting to come back to school. I have not seen that issue anywhere. I don't know how you plan to address it on the committee. If the committee does have anything, I would like to hear about it.

The last thing is how will it affect recruiting? Right now, our coaches go to high schools. I will use my baseball team as a pretty fair example. We go to high schools and we encourage young people to continue their education while participating in their sports.

Now, we will be going to AAA and AA ball parks looking for good players. That is not a good message. We talked this morning about the International Basketball League beginning to play in New England. Coaches, in their 40 days or 50 days, or whatever they are going to have, are not going to be on high-school campuses. They are going to be evaluating professional athletes and trying to bring them back to our campuses. When they have started their graduation rou-

tine, the clock is running against them. There is no way they can possibly graduate in the period of time that you will have remaining. I would just like to bring those issues to your attention here today.

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Staff): Let me take the issue about graduation rates. We have had that question before. The subcommittee has looked at it as really being a financial aid question. Can you give financial aid to this individual if they have just one or two seasons of competition coming from them when they enroll?

The answer is the same. Yes, financial aid legislation applies. You can provide that individual with four years of aid. That would be an institutional decision whether you want to bring that prospect on to your campus for those limited seasons of competition.

You do have the option of providing them with the means by which to complete their education. Also, with the recruiting issue, the subcommittee has heard these concerns. Some of those concerns really are coach or school choices. How do you want to tell your coaches to recruit. What does the school think is appropriate and the type of contact that you bring to your school?

The subcommittee finds it difficult to look at changing regulations to address that. Perhaps one of the problems with the Manual that we have today is that we try to address what we think people will be doing and it will not be appropriate. Those are the choices that the schools and the coaches make. As to the agents, I will let someone else deal with that issue.

Bill Saum (NCAA Staff): Thank you for bringing up the issue of agents. A couple of quick points on that. The membership and the Association have been working with the Uniform State Law Commission for the past year and one-half. We are happy to announce that in July they will sign off on an agent law that we will then market to the 50 states beginning next January. We believe that is going to help a great deal in dealing with some of the challenges that we have.

In regard to how the agent issue will affect some of this amateurism deregulation, I think we really need to begin—and many of us have already done this—to recognize what it is that we are dealing with today. Basically, it is entirely underground. We need to acknowledge that many of our athletes are involved with agents.

What the committee will be doing in February is evaluate and acknowledge that our young people do need some sort of advice as they go into these meetings. What they will also be evaluating is that they really don't want to get into the world of agents continuing to provide benefits to our athletes.

I think there is still a very positive way that we can keep the agent issue in a box and still be comfortable with the amateurism deregulation. The subcommittee will tear into this and not leave campus until we get this fixed in February.

David O'Connor (University of New Hampshire): There are two things I would just like to bring up. Number one, being from New

England, we really have a lot of preparatory schools. A lot of our athletes in the New England area go to a private prep school a year before postgraduate work.

It really is preparing them very well for the university. My concern is with the loss of the grace period. That is really going to affect the preparatory schools in the New England area as far as them being able to offer and attract educational opportunities to prospective student-athletes. Along with that, wouldn't this also encourage coaches to—because they evaluate young prospective student-athletes—ask them or encourage them to possibly leave their high-schools without graduating and then move on to a preparatory school where they would be able to have that extra competition and not be forced to lose that grace period? Or would the graduation date you receive from your postgraduate work of that preparatory school be what you would use for your graduation rate?

Tom Hansen (Pacific-10 Conference): One response would be the latter. We would work with the prep school situation directly. We do not want, however, to let the lack of a high-school graduation stop the process from beginning.

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Staff): Also, there is a built-in mechanism to the legislative process regarding 14.2.4.2. It would indicate the graduation date of your expected class. We have heard from individuals that we have coaches out there encouraging students to actually not graduate from high school so they can engage in organizational competition and not invoke 14.2.4.2.

With that in place—the date of your expected graduation class—that will take care of that loophole.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Leland: Okay. I thank you very much. We will conclude with Commissioner Hansen. First of all, there are three staff people up here who have spent a lot of time on this. Let's express our appreciation to them. (Applause) When the commissioner is done, we will be adjourned.

Mr. Hansen: Once again Ted has stolen my story line. I really wanted to thank the staff for an outstanding job. This is obviously an undertaking of great magnitude and they have been very superb in their leadership. It is very important that Lisa continue to advise the committee as a consultant.

Thank you all very much for your attention. Please, please send us more thoughts, ideas and comments. This is still in the initial stages, and we can make very good use of it. Thanks again.

[The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.]

□ Division II Forum

Sunday Afternoon, January 9, 2000

The Division II Issues Forum on Student-Athlete Health and Safety, and Amateurism Deregulation, was called to order with Division II Management Chair Clint Bryant, Augusta State University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): Good afternoon. I'd like to welcome you to the 2000 Division II issues forum sponsored by the Division II Management Council.

This year, we have two very important issues to address that are significant to all divisions. We appreciate you taking the time to be here for the next two hours. At this time, I'd like to introduce the vice-chair of the Management Council, Barb Schroeder of Regis University. Barb has done an outstanding job, let's give her a hand. (Applause)

Due to time, I'm not going to introduce the Management Council members individually, but at this time will all current Management Council members please stand? Thank you.

We have five new Management Council members joining us after the Convention. If any of those new Management Council members are here, would you please stand?

This forum is designed to provide information to Division II delegates on national issues that may not normally be discussed at the regional seminars or conference meetings. The two topics for discussion today are student-athlete health and safety issues and amateurism. The first topic today will be student-athlete health and safety issues. We're going to keep this limited discussion from 1:40 to 2:30. At this time, I'd like to introduce Jim Watson, the director of athletics from West Liberty State College, who will moderate this portion of the program. Jim.

HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES FORUM

James W. Watson (West Liberty State College): Thank you. Good afternoon, everybody. It's encouraging to see such a wonderful turnout. I've been coming to these forums for a number of years and asking myself wouldn't I rather be out in the sunshine or watching the football game? But out of duty we come and we listen and sometimes we're very informed and sometimes we leave shaking our heads not so sure that we know why we're here.

I heard this morning someone say that this athletic training topic is really a hot topic this year—one of the hotter things that has been going around. I think beyond being a hot topic, it's a high stakes topic for sure.

As you know, in the last few years, the NCAA has reached out to the membership to analyze the extent of health-care coverage that is occurring at various levels throughout the Association. There have been several surveys. Quite honestly, from the results, we haven't gotten very good grades in most cases.

I'm sure there are some excellent athletics programs that score very high when it comes to comprehensive medical coverage for their athletes, but I'm afraid that as we look across the divisions, that some of us don't quite measure up to where we need to be. Poor grades in this area are clearly unacceptable. There is simply too much at stake. We've heard so much talk in recent years about student-athlete welfare. We've written so much about student-athlete welfare. It's in our strategic plan. It's kind of the buzzword. It's time to, as the expression goes, "walk the talk." I'm not so sure that we have done that.

I don't think it's a stretch to call it a moral imperative for all of us to face the music about the status of emergency-care coverage and athletic-training coverage in total at each of our institutions.

Today, we have a distinguished panel that I'm going to introduce. We're going to try to give you some background. I know that a forum ought to be an open exchange of ideas; but unfortunately, we do have to spend some time today bringing those of you up to speed who may not be tuned in on the seriousness of this issue.

As Clint Bryant said yesterday in our Management Council meeting, and I totally agreed with him, this is the tip of the iceberg. This is not just an issue that has come about because of the NATA curriculum changes that you'll learn about. We've had a problem out there for some time. We apparently haven't solved it based on the surveys in a comprehensive analysis that Randy Dick has done with his group.

There clearly is plenty of work to be done. I'm hoping that in this brief time we have today we can bring out the issues and bring some focus, certainly not to the entire problem of how we deal with the health and welfare of student-athletes, obviously that would take far more time than we have. But we want to focus particularly on new information pertaining to what the NATA curriculum changes can mean for us and begin to develop some strategies and commitments as we try to deal with this situation.

At this time, I'd like to introduce the panel. We will hear its presentations and then we'll have some time for your questions.

First of all, I'd like to introduce from the Presidents Council, President Charles Dunn from Henderson State University. We're happy to have him with us today. Next to him is Mr. Dallas Curtis, a student-athlete from Northeastern State. He represents the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. He will certainly tell us the student-athlete's perspective on this important issue and I'm sure carry the information that he gathers from this session back to the student-athletes. To my left is Randy Dick, who is the NCAA senior assistant director of sports sciences and the liaison to the competitive

safeguards committee. Randy, we appreciate all of your efforts with this issue. Elsa Cole, chief NCAA legal counsel. Elsa will provide a perspective that we need from this litigious world that we live in. Next to Elsa is Mr. Dennis Miller from Purdue University. Dennis is the former president of the NATA. We're delighted that he could spend time with us. He has shown a willingness to hear our concerns and to work with us. I'm very appreciative of Dennis' willingness to be with us. Finally, seated on the end, last but not least, Ms. Rochelle Rittgers from Augustana College. She's the director of training services.

At this time, I'd like to ask Randy to share some of the information regarding the surveys that the competitive safeguards committee has conducted in recent years.

Randy Dick (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Jim. My role here is to try to lay the groundwork for what the current situation is at our institutions with regard to emergency care and coverage.

In early 1998, the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports issued a survey to the membership asking athletic trainers—they answered the survey—what the current situation was with regard to coverage at practices and games in the regular season and the nontraditional season for skill instruction, and for strength and conditioning.

We wanted to get a feel for what currently was happening at the institutions. That was the purpose of the survey. We sampled 50 percent of the member institutions. It was a stratified sample across all three divisions with the help of our research staff. The responder of the survey was the athletic trainer. We looked at 11 different sports.

In the handout you have there are some bullets that talk about the major results of that survey. Again, this lays the groundwork for where we are currently in terms of our situation with regard to an emergency-care plan, which is a plan that is in place for every practice and game, skill instruction, strength and conditioning, and so on. If something happens, is there a pathway of getting emergency care to the athlete? Ten percent or more of our institutions did not have an emergency plan for the regular-season practices or games. Significantly fewer schools, about 25 percent or more, did not have an emergency plan for the nontraditional season practice and game. Almost one-third of the institutions do not have emergency plans for skill instruction and strength and conditioning.

So as Jim mentioned, we're not in an optimal situation. It should also be mentioned that when you look at these across divisions, Division I had the best record overall, and Divisions II and III dropped off significantly.

With regard to the medical coverage—having someone at each practice and game qualified and delegated to render emergency care, someone with at least basic training and first aid—almost 100 percent of the schools has someone qualified to do that at regular-season practice and games. There were a few sports that had exceptions—

most notably cross country and track—but that number was down to about 60 percent.

Adequate medical coverage was significantly reduced, as it was with the emergency plan, in the out-of-season or nontraditional-season practices and games. That number dropped down to somewhere between 60 and 80 percent, depending on the sport in the division. Fewer than 50 percent of institutions in any division had emergency-care coverage for skill instruction and strength and conditioning. Also, fewer than 50 percent of institutions at all divisions had athletic training or athletic personnel trained in first aid and CPR.

Those are important results that lay the groundwork for what our current situation is. We're going to hear about future challenges, but the point is, right now, in our world today, we have room for improvement in terms of emergency care and coverage of our athletes.

I need to talk about one other point, and then I'll yield to Dallas. I'd like to lay the groundwork for what is our primary medical coverage resource right now. That resource today is the certified or the student-athletic trainer.

We'll talk later about student-athletic trainers. You need to realize that the student-athletic trainer is in our institutions now. They are gaining hours—hands-on training hours—in order to qualify for a certification and exam. The student-athletic trainer has two routes to this exam. One is the internship route. They have an academic curriculum they need to achieve and 1,500 hours of hands-on work, which is where you got most of your resources. There is also another route—the curriculum route—at about 113 schools that our institutions currently have. They also have academic requirements and about 800 hours of hands-on training. You can currently go by either one of those two routes in your four-year career. Once you complete that and get those hours of hands-on training, then you can sit for the exam that will certify you to become a certified athletic trainer. So that lays a little bit of the groundwork for where we are currently.

Mr. Watson: Thank you, Randy. Now, taking off on what Randy just said, you may have heard that there was only one route of certification.

Beginning in 2004, the internship route—allowing one to sit for the NATA certification test—will no longer be available, which means that the impact is already being felt. Dennis will elaborate on the new curriculum changes in a little bit. But the impact is being felt already from the standpoint of good-faith recruiting. If young people come to campuses where you have internship programs—in other words, noncurriculum campuses—and they ask if you have athletic training or any route for me if I'm interested in student training, you are going to have to say in good faith that we are not going to be able to help you with internship hours because that route will no longer exist by the time you matriculate and you therefore won't be able to sit for the exam.

I think we are beginning to already see the effects, perhaps not in the numbers of student-trainers on any given day this year, but cer-

tainly as we recruit or even respond to inquiries from potential students coming to that institution without a curriculum. We're going to have to tell them that this will soon be a dead-end road for them.

With that said, I'd like to take some comments from the student-athletes' perspective, particularly relative to what role he feels through his experience that student-trainers specifically have played in the overall health-care coverage on his campus. Dallas.

Dallas Curtis (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Northeastern State University): Thank you, Jim. Good afternoon. On behalf of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, it's an honor to be here.

One of the first factors that our committee deemed important was that each institution have an emergency plan to cover all student-athletes. This would have to include both regular and off-season training. Student-athletes and parents expect appropriate coverage from their institution; however, it has been proven in many instances that student-athletes are not adequately covered by an emergency plan.

Secondly, we feel that not only should we receive the needed attention, but equitable coverage among each sport as well. We have concluded that certain sports are receiving more coverage than others and this is not necessarily because of the increased potential for injury in those sports. This should definitely be eliminated for the welfare of the student-athlete.

Lastly, our committee strongly suggests that a certified trainer oversee all student-trainers of that institution—whether it be by phone or radio. A feasible means of communication must be available between them at all times.

The underlying question is, will the NATA be able to meet the demands of student-athletes by dismissing the internship program? From this, I hope that we are able to discuss possible solutions in the near future. I thank you very much.

Mr. Watson: Thank you, Dallas. I know you will remain for any questions that might be directed toward you regarding the student-athletes' perspective.

I'm going to introduce Elsa Cole here in a moment. Unfortunately, when we hear from lawyers about the legal climate on any issue—I say unfortunately not because we don't need and want that information—it's because something went wrong. It's always after the fact. I think that underlines the clear importance of trying to get out in front of this issue, which we all know we're definitely behind. We've got to turn that around so that we're not looking at more legal case law developed on our campuses because we failed to get a hold on this situation. So Elsa, if you would, please comment on your perspective of this issue.

Elsa Cole (NCAA Staff): I want to speak as a lawyer, of course, but I don't want you to think that we don't also care about the welfare of the student-athlete. Obviously, that's what should be driving

our decision to do this, but it never hurts if you are having trouble getting your campus to listen to let them know what the legal liability is. Sometimes that's a little extra incentive to get moving on a matter like this.

A school's legal responsibility for rendering emergency care to an injured student-athlete is determined by the law of the state in which the school is located. In particular, the way that state's courts have interpreted what we call case law—that means it's law that's developed through a number of cases, not laws that are passed by a state legislature that a court later interprets.

That means there is no one standard of legal liability that would apply to every school that's represented by the people in this room. There is no federal law that applies in this area. You really need to understand what your own state has said your legal liability is. However, there are some general principles that most states will follow to give you some guidance to determine if your school is currently providing adequate emergency care.

Because these principles do vary from state to state, your college legal counsel is your best guide as to whether your program's particular emergency plan will be deemed adequate if challenged in your state's courts. What I'm going to say should really be the beginning of your inquiry into this subject rather than the end of it.

The most common legal claim that's made against a school for inadequate emergency care is that the school was negligent in the provision of that care. To prove that the school is negligent, generally, state courts will require that the person who is making the claim—and I say person because it could be parents of a student who has died, not necessarily the injured student—has to establish in court with sufficient evidence to meet the court's standard that there was a duty of care or obligation that was recognized by the law in that state that required the school to meet a certain standard of conduct, and the school failed to meet that standard. The school's failure to meet that standard caused an injury to the student-athlete or to parents standing in the shoes of the student-athlete. The true loss or damage resulted as a consequence of the school failing to meet that standard of care.

So one of the first questions is what is the duty of care that a school must meet. To the average student, the only standard that a school has to meet is called ordinary duty of care. Constant supervision is not required of all activities, only reasonable care has to be taken to protect the average student against reasonably foreseeable dangers.

If an injury is not reasonably foreseeable, there is no duty of care to the average student. If there is no legal duty of care, then the school can't be held negligent for not getting emergency aid to a student in that situation.

Now it's different, some courts have said, if you are talking about a recruited student-athlete. Several state courts have said that be-

cause the school's athletic program benefits from the talents of a recruited student-athlete, the school has a greater duty of care towards that student than it does towards its average student or the nonrecruited student-athlete.

The most well-known case in this regard was brought in Pennsylvania against Gettysburg College by the parents of Drew Kleinknecht, the recruited lacrosse player who had no history of heart problems and collapsed and died from a cardiac arrest during a lacrosse practice.

The parents claim the college was negligent because it had no written emergency plan. Also, they claim because the coaches present at the practice were not certified in CPR, the school was negligent. In addition, they claimed that there were no trainers or student-trainers who knew CPR at the practice site, and there was not any ambulance present at the practice site.

The appellate court that reviewed this matter after the trial court had found in favor of the school and then the parents appealed and went to the trial court. The appellate court sent it back to the trial court and said that the college has a duty to be reasonably prepared for handling medical emergencies that foreseeably arise during a student's participation in an intercollegiate contact sport for which the college recruited him.

I note that the appellate court did not decide that the school was negligent for not having all those things I listed to you that the parents claimed that they should have. Instead, the court sent it back to the trial court for a jury to determine negligence—to determine if in fact the school had met the duty of care.

As a defense lawyer, any time a case gets beyond a motion for summary judgment to dismiss and actually goes to trial in front of a jury, you have reduced your chances of successfully defending that case significantly because the statistics show that almost 70 percent of cases that are tried go in favor of a plaintiff in this kind of situation.

If you haven't met that duty of care sufficiently for a court to dismiss the case at that point, you are probably facing liability, because that is what a jury is going to find. You are not the sympathetic plaintiff in this situation I've just described.

Not every state has adopted that standard of care. Utah, for example, has specifically rejected it in a case that I also cite some language on in that handout. I want to point out that the quotes that I have in that handout of what various courts have said are unique to those cases. They are a guide on what a court may say in your situation. If you are not in Utah or Pennsylvania and your state courts have not yet ruled in this way, this is simply a way that they might rule, but you can't say for certain whether they will rule. You really have to go back and see how they ruled in similar-type cases if there isn't already a standard case in this period and there are many states in which there is not yet a ruling by their highest court as to what the standard of care is.

In Utah, the court said that this Kleinknecht case that I spoke about was developed looking at the kind of duty of care you owe to elementary and secondary students and therefore they dismiss that as being a correct standard. However, at a minimum, you are probably going to have to show that you exercised some kind of reasonable care for your students.

What is proof of reasonable care by athletic trainers since we're going to speak about those people? In particular, does a trainer have to be licensed to show that reasonable care was exercised, or is failure by a school to use a licensed trainer in those states where licensing is required? About 30 out of 50 states require that the athletic trainer be licensed. Does that mean that a school is automatically negligent?

Utah's court that looked at this question said there is not automatic liability for a university that doesn't use a licensed trainer even though there might be a possibility that you have the ability to be licensed in that state. But what they will look at is if the trainer failed to exercise a degree of care and skill considered proper by the correct and accepted standards of the trainer profession.

In other words, if you don't use the care exercised by skilled trainers in your area, that is proof and evidence that you, in fact, were negligent in having that person apply the emergency aid. The court said a trainer practicing without a license could be evidence of negligence by the school. That evidence can be overcome by showing that the trainer's conduct complies with the standard in the area. So it's not an automatic loss for the school, but it's obviously going to be one more hurdle that you have to leap in order to show that the school was not negligent and there is always a question of why set up hurdles that you don't need to in these situations.

Again, you need to be familiar with your state law in this area. I urge you to consult with your own college counsel about whether you are using an unlicensed trainer in a state in which a license is required, what kind of vulnerability you may have created for your institution.

Mr. Watson: Elsa, if you develop a plan because you learn and accept the liability to take on the responsibility, you develop that plan and you publish that plan and you imply that you are going to go by that plan, but then you do not staff that plan, you are going to have trouble finding someplace to go for a defense are you not?

Ms. Cole: That's right. I'll talk later about developing an emergency plan and the extent to which that develops liability. If you are going to create a plan, you better implement the plan.

Mr. Watson: Thank you.

Our next guest is Mr. Dennis Miller. As I mentioned earlier, he is the head trainer for Purdue University and former president of the NATA. Dennis is going to tell us about some of the thinking behind the Association's decision to eliminate the internship route. I'm sure they put many long hours into reaching this deliberation. I'm sure

they have very strong reasons for what they have done and we need to hear those. We also need to ask Dennis to hear what you all feel about what this does to us on our campuses. So at this time, Dennis, if you would please share some of your thoughts with us.

Dennis Miller (Purdue University): Thank you, Jim. As early as the middle of the 1960s, the athletic trainer was trying to develop a standard practice for this profession.

In the early 1970s, they developed the certification exam. This is a voluntary national standard. People who set these kind of exams have given us feedback that this was probably one of the most successful attempts by a profession to develop a standard for themselves.

Following the development of the certification exam came the gradual development of curriculums on campus. In the middle '80s, as we continued with the dual route to certification, i.e., the internship route that we're discussing or the curricular route, it became very clear that the internship student was not performing nearly as well on the certification exam as the curriculum student.

As the states moved to regulatory practice acts around the country—we are now around 37 or 38 states that have some form of regulation of the athletic trainer in the state—we started to have difficulty trying to explain to the individual states how we could justify a route to certification that did not have a substantial academic background while we had another route that is in the more mainstream medical model of education for an allied medical profession.

That led us to the fact that our members were coming back to us and giving us feedback that we were having difficulty with our members being successful out there as an allied medical profession because of that.

So in the middle '90s we established a plan to improve the educational standard of the athletic trainer. Our motto, if you will, to our members was that we would take our profession up and on into the new millennium as a functioning, viable profession allied with the medical profession.

This led to the decision to eliminate the internship route by the year 2004, which has been indicated. It means that by this incoming fall class, one should not be bringing students in and promising them the opportunity to go the internship route. People have asked us why. Basically it's very simple. You want your medical personnel to be on top of the game. The body of knowledge in our profession has expanded tremendously. The technology is continuing to grow by leaps and bounds. Our members demanded that they have the ability to be able to keep up with this. Our patients, the student-athletes, were coming into us at the secondary school level and the collegiate level and the junior college level having been the beneficiaries of these changes.

This led us to the establishment of the educational standards. It asked for us to develop what we considered to be standards of practice for the intercollegiate athlete. The NATA instituted a task force to develop standards for the minimum care of the intercollegiate athlete.

This document has been in progress for the past two years. At the current time, this document is now in its final stages. It is out for external review to other medical organizations, such as the American Medical Society for Sports Medicine, the Sports Medicine Society and the American College of Sports Medicine. It will be presented this month to the NCAA sports medicine meeting. Next month, it will be presented to the NATA board of directors for its possible final approval. So that's a short, brief background of what our challenges are in the future.

Mr. Watson: Thank you very much, Dennis.

At this time, I'd like to ask Rochelle Rittgers to give us her perspective on how these changes will impact our campuses.

Rochelle Rittgers (Augustana College, South Dakota): You probably are familiar with some of the tasks that student athletic trainers have done as they train and practice up to now. I will just give you some ideas if you don't have some of the knowledge.

Obviously, they've been able to do water and ice for us and, perhaps, pack kits and get travel supplies ready for us. Taping and wrapping is something we always look to student trainers to do. These are things that you are probably very familiar with. We also utilized our student-trainers to assist with rehab situations. They help us with some of the paperwork such as writing injury reports and coach's reports. They input computer data. All of our information needs to be statistically organized so we can keep track of it for outcome purposes at the end of the season, and they do all of those things. For some of those things we rely on them to do, we really don't realize the impact that that will have on us at a time when we don't have those people educated in order to be able to do those tasks. I believe that we will have plenty of assistants with regard to some possibilities that Randy will mention later—the obvious duties that we'll be able to utilize student workers for. But some of the duties that come from an educated student will not easily be replaced. The impact will begin truly after this year.

This year's freshman class is the last class of students that will be able to complete their programs by the end of 2003, which would be the last year that they can sit for the certification exam in an internship program. Next year's freshman class would not be able to achieve that task; therefore, it is up to us not to recruit students under the idea that they would be able to finish their athletic-training program.

So as our seniors graduate starting this year, we will lose one class per year up through 2004 of qualified athletic-training students. So we will gradually see an impact that is developing starting next year and reaching its peak in the year 2004.

The numbers that we've been able to utilize with regard to students vary depending on whether you have a curriculum program or an internship program. In the past, or at least up to now, we have been able to maintain curriculum programs with each student trainer to each certified athletic trainer that we have in our pro-

grams. The internship programs have not had a regulation. The NATA regulated the curriculum programs, but they do not regulate the internship programs; therefore, certified athletic trainers have developed a student-athlete training program with as many students as they could perhaps manage and feel comfortable with.

I know of programs that have as few student trainers as 10 to 12. I also know of programs that have as many as 40 to 50 student-trainers. That is the manpower that we are going to lose as a result of the internship program idea or concept being lost. That is a difficult transition that we will have to make, but I believe we will be able to offer you some solutions for that today.

Mr. Watson: Thank you, Rochelle. We can leave here today feeling that there is work to be done and be talked about on our campuses. Then it's time for those of us who report to the presidents to develop our message and hopefully some persuasive technique to convince our CEOs why we need to expend the necessary dollars as part of the solution to improve our health-care coverage. When we were on the prep call for this session, I asked President Dunn, who is our next speaker, if he could give me some insight as to what makes presidents tick. He said when he figured that out, he'd let me know. So, Mr. President, if you've got that figured out, please share that with the group.

Charles Dunn (Henderson State University): Thank you, Jim. I've been working on it. I'll have to tell you that to provide a CEO perspective, I've considered this issue carefully. I know that CEOs have many, many issues that demand their attention and their time.

Sometimes we have so many that we don't act so much when we see the light as when we feel the heat. This is one of those issues that has great potential to provide great heat and that issue being, of course, the provision of adequate emergency health care to our student-athletes.

Of course, this is an issue of student welfare, not just student-athlete welfare, but student welfare. For that reason alone, the CEOs should be paying attention to this issue.

As a matter of fact, on many campuses we're seeing the CEO, the athletic personnel, the student health personnel and student services personnel try to integrate our approach to dealing with student-athlete concerns into an overall student welfare concern. So I think that's an issue you should at least consider. But beyond the issue of student welfare, there are at least some very practical reasons for CEOs to be interested in this particular issue. Elsa Cole has already addressed the issue of legal liability. That is an issue in most of the things that we do.

Having adequate insurance coverage at your institution to protect the student who might be injured, and from a liability stance, to protect the university in case it is sued or in case it is found to be negligent in providing inadequate health care to its students is another issue.

The potential budgetary impact, if you consider or have started considering the NATA recommendations is significant. Those are issues that you need to be dealing with at this point and not waiting until 2004 to deal with.

I guess my specific advice to the CEOs and ADs and others in this audience would be to go home and make certain that you have a workable emergency health-care plan in place for your student-athletes and determine if it is workable, if it is something that can be implemented. Make sure that it's not just a piece of paper that says, yes, we've thought about this and this is what we'll do in case of emergency. It is something that must be achievable. So that is my first and really most important piece of advice I will give you.

I would say also, though, that you as CEOs and ADs should consider very carefully any legislation that you see proposed at the NCAA or in your conference that expands practice opportunities for student-athletes. Because when we expand practice opportunities, you are also expanding your opportunity for emergency health care. As the survey that was mentioned earlier demonstrates, we do a pretty good job of covering the major sports when they are in context. We often don't do a very good job of covering the health-care needs of our student-athletes when they are practicing, when they are conditioning, or in some of the minor sports that you simply see no coverage at all. So these are the issues that I think you should deal with.

As for ADs, for those of you who try to persuade and try to get the attention of your CEOs in this matter, I think there are a number of routes you can take. One is just presenting the facts and information. I know many of you meet with the CEO frequently or on a routine basis. That's the time to bring that type of issue up. Meet with your legal counsel of the university and explain to the legal counsel the importance of minimizing the liability that the institution faces in this area. These are just some of the ideas that we have discussed to deal with this issue from a CEO perspective.

Mr. Watson: Thank you, Mr. President. It's been suggested that the athletics department take strong ownership of this issue. I would suggest that the ownership goes beyond the athletics department, as President Dunn alluded to in the fact that this is not just a student-athlete issue. It truly is a student issue, and it's in the best interest of the overall image of the institution to have a risk-management plan that avoids negative publicity.

I would suggest that we expand the ownership somewhat outside the goals and responsibilities of the athletics department. Often, these kinds of things are balanced on the backs of the athletics departments, as you well know. Sure, you want another trainer. Fine, just carve the salary out of your budget and that isn't going to get it done. Thank you, Mr. President.

As we draw to a close, we want to leave ample time for questions. Elsa Cole is going to give us a couple of brief recommendations from a legal standpoint on some possible solutions and then Randy has

some other suggestions. Then we'll go right into your questions.

Elsa Cole (NCAA Staff): Thank you. What should a school do to reduce its legal liability in this area? As stated before, adopt and implement a written plan. I emphasize written, because that shows that you actually do have such a plan. You didn't create it on the spot after the fact to try to protect yourself.

Develop a written emergency plan for all sports using recruited athletes. Review the qualifications of coaches, trainers, student-trainers and first responders to render emergency aid. Provide training opportunities if that is what you need to get them up to the standard that you think is appropriate.

If you are playing at home or you are playing away, know the location to practice and playing sites and the closest phones or other communication devices to contact emergency personnel. Review what the access to the physical location will be for emergency personnel. If there are barriers, know how to remove them.

Review with your campus counsel your emergency plan to make sure it complies with your state standard of care. Develop a system to notify key administrators, including the campus public relations office of student medical emergencies in a timely fashion. My experience after being on two campuses for a total of about 20 years is that these incidents do not occur 9 to 5, Monday through Friday. The greatest emergency comes in at 11:30 on a Saturday night when you can't reach anybody. So not only know who your initial key contacts are, but who are your backups if you can't reach a key administrator.

Train administrators how to inform and respond promptly to inquiries from family members of injured student-athletes in ways that demonstrate the institution's concern for the student-athletes and avoid needless inflaming of the family's emotions toward the school.

Randy Dick (NCAA Staff): I'm going to close by asking where do we go from here? In October, the NCAA Executive Committee charged the competitive safeguards committee to engage in the comprehensive review of this issue; specifically, citing options for institutions that may not be able to develop a curriculum program to assist them in meeting their emergency medical-care needs.

Since that time, we've had a couple of conference calls with Division II. We've had a couple of forums at the Convention. We developed some materials for you to look at and we still haven't met as a committee yet. So we've got a lot done so far, but we have got a lot more to do.

Your feedback in the next 15 minutes will be part of that, so I encourage you to provide that. In addition, there are a couple of other points from the competitive safeguards committee perspective. It's been on record since 1996 saying exactly what President Dunn said. If legislation comes down the pike that expands playing and practice seasons and you can't reasonably expand your medical coverage to go along with it, you might not want to consider supporting it. So think about that.

In addition to that, we've talked about emergency plans and resources. In your handout, there is an example of a template emergency plan that was put together by Ron Courson at the University of Georgia. That template has been added to our Web site under the sports science area. It's a place where you can start if you don't have a template to develop your own plan and make it unique to your school. You also can apply it to all of your sports. I encourage you to look at.

I'm not going to go through all the bullets, but we've got a couple other suggestions in your handout. We have a lot of schools today that do not either have the curriculum or the internship route. One of our goals is to locate and identify those schools and figure out how they have been dealing with this problem. I think they are a great resource that the rest of us can learn from.

Mr. Watson: Thank you very much, Randy. At this time, we want to hear your thoughts. One of the goals in this forum was for it to be informational and provocative. We hope that you can share with us your thoughts. If you would, identify yourself by name and institution and let us know to which panelist you would like to direct your question.

Dana K. Skinner (University of Massachusetts at Lowell): I have a legal question. You made the point about recruited athletes. I guess you could probably argue that virtually every student on the college campus is recruited, either by the campus or by athletics—however they get there. Are intramural or recreational sports under the athletics department? If you've got an intramural football game on Sunday and somebody incurs a serious injury, how is that any different than if it happens with a student-athlete? I'm curious as to the legal perspective there.

Elsa Cole (NCAA Staff): We don't have a good body of law to give us guidance in the nonrecruited student-athlete situation. The court found the school had greater duty of care to the recruited athlete because the athletics program benefits from the talent of that program. One could argue that it's not the same, that the school doesn't benefit in the same way from the talents of students who are not recruited on an intramural team. Therefore, you would have only the normal, ordinary duty of care that you have to any student who trips over a power line on the campus or whatever. That's what probably would be argued in that situation. It would be a lower standard of care that you would have to give to those students.

Ms. Skinner: What if my child is out playing intramural football and he breaks his neck and there is nobody there? I'm not trying to get more training coverage. I've got more than I can handle based on this conversation. But if somebody snaps their neck out there and there is no response whatsoever and nobody knows what to do, where do I go? I would suggest that there is probably not much of a possibility that the institution is going to be negligent-free in that scenario, would you agree with that?

Ms. Cole: Right. I remind you that the standard of care you owe to the average student is to protect them against reasonably foreseeable dangers. One could argue that in intramural football, there is a reasonable, foreseeable danger in a contact sport like that. For the kind of serious injury you just described, that might mean for those types of games you would have more of a duty of care than you might have for let's say members of intramural track, where that kind of danger is not normally reasonably foreseeable.

James C. Redd (Northwest Missouri State University): I'd like to direct my question to Dennis Miller.

Dennis, we've had an outstanding internship program for a number of years at Northwest. In your estimation, what would it take to hire additional people to go into a curriculum program? What are the minimums to move in that direction?

Secondly, we have a lot of student-trainers who have come through our program and sat and passed the exam. They went on to be very productive athletic trainers. Will a curriculum program reduce the number of athletic trainers available for secondary schools as well as colleges and universities by this curriculum proposal?

Dennis Miller (Purdue University): When looking at your first question about moving from an internship program to a curriculum program, probably the best answer I can give you is that the additional personnel who you are talking about will be the primary responsibility of the college that sponsors this educational program.

Mr. Redd: That would be the college of education or wherever?

Mr. Miller: Correct. The curriculums are controlled by an outside agency. In our case, it's called CAAHEP. They are not controlled by the National Athletic Trainers Association. They evaluate your curriculums like they do other curriculums on your campus. They have certain guidelines that you are required to follow.

The second part of your question about a reduction in the number of licensed or certified athletic trainers is too early for us to tell. I feel like there is going to be an increase in the number of curriculums out there. We think that the improvement in the education is going to allow for a higher pass/fail percentage out there. Whether we are going to increase or decrease the supplies, I do not know.

Mr. Redd: We pushed hard for the athletic trainers in our public schools in our area to be hired by the public school district. You get into a situation there for certification in the teaching area along with athletic training. Are there any suggestions that your profession would have in the direction for a partial teaching loan?

Mr. Miller: That's a really difficult question to address.

I would approach it from this standpoint. There are over 22,000 certified or licensed athletic trainers nationwide. About 18 to 20 percent of those professionals identify themselves as working at the college or university setting. Approximately 40 percent represent themselves as working at a clinic hospital or private clinic setting. The remainder identify themselves as working in a secondary school set-

ting, whether it be teacher/athletic trainer or clinic outreach athletic trainer. How this will be affected, we do not know.

Mr. Redd: We are in a rural area and clinic opportunities really are not there. We do have an athletic trainer in our public school district who is completely certified, but I know we're not the norm in our area. That's a concern that I have. There will not be people who are certified to teach or certified to be trainers and consequently there may be fewer.

Mr. Miller: I can only say that from our membership the supply far exceeds the demand.

Mr. Redd: Prepared to teach?

Mr. Miller: Both.

Mr. Redd: Thank you.

Edward Hammond (Fort Hays State University): Before I ask my question or make my comment, I guess I would be interested, Dennis, of the 22,000 athletic trainers out there, what percentage of those obtain certification through the internship route versus the academic route? I heard a figure, but I don't know if it's correct.

Mr. Miller: Approximately—and this is the last few years—60 percent of those who sit for the certification exam each year have been from the internship route.

Mr. Hammond: That's what I had heard, too. I guess my comment then in answer to the question about if there will be a significant decline in athletic trainers, the answer is "yes." If 60 percent of the athletic trainers were certified through the internship program, and after this year that internship program is not going to be available, there is going to be a substantial reduction in athletic trainers.

Secondly, at the same time, the athletic trainers have been pushing to increase the standard for the academic program. We have a certified or accredited academic program and we've had to add additional faculty to keep that accreditation under the new standards. A number of us have been raising questions of a different kind. Is this a movement to significantly increase the salary situation and reduce the pool of athletic trainers? It may appear to be that way if you look at it from a resource standpoint.

We had to add two more faculty just in our accredited program to maintain the accreditation standards, and the ratios for supervision have changed as well. Some of us believe, Dennis, that this is an effort to reduce the supply and demand and increase the value of athletic trainers.

My second comment is in terms of what we should do as an Association. I believe that there is an important document that we have that we can do something about. We can't do anything about what the athletic trainers are doing as a professional organization. I don't blame them. They are adopting the medical model. In the medical model, the physicians have controlled the number of physicians in categories for a long time. So it's very easy to see why they want to adopt that. But the single document that I believe is most pivotal,

that we do have control over, is the minimum standards of care. From a liability standpoint, minimum standards of care are going to be the critical element. Whatever we establish as the minimum standards of care are going to be that critical threshold we are all going to have to meet, or we are going to assume some liability.

It's kind of like the question on intramurals. If you own and operate a pool, as we do, you have to operate within the minimum standards of care. If something happens in that pool, you are going to be liable. Over time, those minimum standards for the pool have been developed by the American Red Cross. It says you have to have a life guard present or due notice that there isn't one there and they are swimming at their risk. You have to have a floating device for every so many surface feet of water. You need a reach pole that can reach to the center of the pool and on and on and on. If you do all of these things in managing and running your pool, you can manage your liability. If something happens, you can go into court and contend that you did everything foreseeable in terms of meeting your minimum standard of care.

One of the things that concerns me is that at the time that we are seeing the academic standards raised on the academic programs and athletic training, we're seeing the internship programs eliminated from athletic training. We also have a document that's being put forward to try to develop the consensus so it becomes a national recognized minimum standard of care. We also have a document that says you have to have a certified or licensed trainer in your programs.

If we establish that, we reduce the number of ways in which trainers need to be available, and then we adopt a minimum standards of care document that says they have to be there at a certain ratio, then I think we are putting ourselves in a real difficult position.

We have to look at all three of those things together—what's happening on the academic program side, what's happening on the internship side, and what's happening on the minimum care side of the liability issue as far as the president is concerned.

So I would urge the NCAA as they look at the proposed minimum standards of care document that they don't lock us into a certain kind of staffing pattern that's going to cause us to go out and try to compete for a very small number of people who are going to be fully certified under the new standards.

Right now, they are grandfathering in the people who are in the system. So you may not have the problem immediately. But five years or 10 years from now, we're going to be looking at a significant problem because they turned the faucet off on availability and they've increased the standards on the other side of it.

I'd be open to anyone's reaction either to the importance of minimum standards of care document that I believe is going to the NCAA committee or comments from the athletic trainers.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State Missouri): I'd first like to comment to a couple of comments that Ed made. At Central Mis-

souri State, we also have an outstanding internship program that we've had for many, many years. We have many trainers who, as my colleague at Northwest Missouri has said, come up through the internship method.

As we look towards curriculum programs, many state coordinating boards have policies that are getting much more difficult to duplicate academic programs with institutions within a state. So program duplication causes a problem for all those people who have the curriculum program and couple that with the fact that students provide an outstanding service for us. Dennis, I might just ask you, over the years, we've had the students we know within our programs working with certified trainers who provide a valuable service. The care that they've had out there through these years is a valuable commodity for our athletic program and we think we've got great rewards back in turn. So, should the internship program go away, which it looks like it will, what will be the carrot that we can attract that student-trainer with? What will we offer them to say we want you to be in there and we'll get you CPR certified and so on and forth? How do you see that panning out in the future?

Mr. Miller: I think both Rochelle and I can speak to that. I do believe, first of all, that this is not an attempt to eliminate the university or college from utilizing student assistants at any point.

So what is the carrot? Currently, the carrot that is dangled out to the internship student is clinical education. You shouldn't eliminate the clinical education opportunity. We don't think that down the road that that even is totally going to be eliminated. We have encouraged our educators to look at joint programs, sharing programs between the universities. For example, we have a curriculum, but there are five or six schools within a radius of our curriculum that could benefit from professional semesters and students who are in our curriculum but getting clinical education on another campus.

We have that same question coming to us from the NAIA schools and the junior colleges, et cetera, so we think that you can still develop a core of student assistants. It may have to take a different form, it may have to take a different name and the like, but we don't think that this is going to eliminate a university or college's opportunity to utilize students.

Mr. Watson: Thank you very much. A couple of closing thoughts. Our campuses and our training rooms and our athletics programs are the laboratories for the NATA and trainers to be—whether they're in curriculums or whether they have been in internships. So I think we have a real stake in this for a lot of reasons.

Someone asked me the other day, how can the NATA do this? Aren't there antitrust laws? We've surely heard about antitrust in the last year. All I can do is thank Dennis for being here because he's been on the hot seat.

I would like on behalf of all the student-athletes in the Association, particularly in Division II, to issue a respectful challenge, if I

could, not only to the NATA but to all of us in the room. That challenge would be to go back and to look for some way, as Jerry has just suggested, that we can make the student experience count for something at noncurriculum institutions, something that can be documented. It may not lead to them sitting for the test, but it will be something that will clearly show that they made a contribution and they deserve this documentation that might help them in their graduate studies or wherever they go.

My challenge to the folks in this room, the athletics administrators, again, on behalf of the student-athletes, we need to roll up our sleeves, all of us, myself included, and go back to our campuses, take an honest look at where we are and be the leaders we can be to start to work towards the solution of this problem.

We've all been there for the big game and we've all lost that game, at least most of us, and we've said life will go on. If we lose a student-athlete, we will lose a part of our life with that student-athlete. Thank you very much.

AMATEURISM DEREGULATION FORUM

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): Our second topic will deal with amateurism issues in Division II.

I'd like to introduce Allen Sessoms, president of Queens College in New York who will provide an introduction for the amateurism part of this issues forum.

Allen Lee Sessoms (Queens College, New York): The topic of amateurism is a major issue. I hope we can make presentations to you that will provide some clear understanding of where the project team on amateurism has been going within Division II. I'd like to start by introducing the other presenters: Tony Capon is the FAR at University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown, and chair of the Division II Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement; Lisa Dehon, former student-athlete reinstatement representative and current amateurism consultant; Julie Roe-Sumner, director of student-athlete reinstatement for the Association.

Other members of the project team are Clint Bryant, who you have already met, the director of athletics at Augusta State and chair of the Division II Management Council; Heather Andrews, SAAC representative and student-athlete at Missouri Southern; Kent Wyatt, former president of Delta State University; Carl McAloose, commissioner of the Great Lakes Valley Conference; Carol Dunn, director of athletics at Cal State Los Angeles; Dale Clayton, men's basketball coach at Carson-Newman; Sue Williams, who is the women's cross country coach at the University of California, Davis; Bill Saum, NCAA director of gambling and agents; and Jennifer Strawling, student-athlete safety representative.

We'll be going through a power point presentation. I'll do the introductions and then turn it over to my colleagues. We have a session overview that will cover the background and time line of the project

team, philosophical themes as we address the amateurism issues, seasons-of-competition rule, and specific area of analysis, which includes prize money, draft, signing of contracts, competition with professionals and the ever-interesting issue of pay for play.

The definition of amateurism has been around for over 100 years. Ced Dempsey, as one of his key initiatives, has been urging an Association-wide reexamination and reconsideration of this definition.

You might be aware that several years ago there was tremendous concern about the dominance of older student-athletes on championship teams in Division II. Particular emphasis was focused on international student-athletes. There was a proposal for some regulation in this area. We set up a project team to take a look at this and concluded that after several surveys, age simply does not have a significant impact. Older student-athletes do not have a significant impact in championship competition at the Division II level.

Under the guidance of the Division II Management Council, we were asked to take a broader look at amateurism to see if given the anecdotal information there is a problem, whether we could cut some redefinition of the issue and then try to address the particular concerns expressed over and over again by the membership.

We decided to focus in the first instance on preenrollment competitive experiences for those prospective student-athletes after they leave high school but before they enroll in our institutions. We will be addressing, however, postenrollment experiences as well, and then focusing on the deregulation efforts within Division II.

The team has met several times. The information gathering period was from January to August, 1999. There were three or four face-to-face meetings, and a couple on the phone. Since October, we have been sharing ideas with the membership and gathering feedback. Two meetings have taken place since then. We plan to continue that exercise through April and then in June begin the development of legislation for presentation and consideration at the Convention in 2001.

We have two themes of principles that guide us in all of our discussion. The first and of primary importance is student-athlete welfare.

We have decided after some careful consideration that, in fact, student-athlete welfare has not been the principle and primary driving force of the Association. That is an issue that is central to what we are considering here and we stated that boldly. When you see our recommendations, you will realize it is, in fact, the central theme of what we're trying to do. Competitive equity to address the issues raised over and over again anecdotally by ADs, coaches and others also needs to be addressed.

So with that, I'd like to turn the podium over to Tony for discussion.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): Thank you, President Sessoms. To begin with, I want to emphasize a couple of points. Division II is investigating amateurism issues. Division I

is doing so and Division III has begun a process as well.

The process that we are engaged in is in no way driven by the process that's going on in Division I. We now have a federation. There is a Division I amateurism committee that's looking at the issue as well. The committees are working along parallel lines, but our analyses are going at parallel lines because our analyses are going in parallel directions. This is a Division II initiative. We are going to pursue it regardless of what the other divisions do. It's a Division II driven issue.

The second point—to reemphasize what President Sessoms said—is that we are not dealing with postenrollment issues. We are dealing only with the preenrollment phase. We probably will begin discussing the postenrollment phase at our next meeting in February.

I'd like to give a little background into where this process has come from and where it is going. There have been in the new membership some issues in recent years dealing with amateurism. President Sessoms has discussed very briefly Proposition 150. Despite the findings of the Prop 150 team that age doesn't have a significant impact, there continues to be concerns in the Division II membership that sport-specific athletes are older. That has been discussed a number of times. A second issue that has been out there for a long time is the impact of the international student-athlete in Division II sports.

While surveys indicate that fewer than 4 percent of the athletes in Division II are international, that percent is higher in certain sports such as tennis, soccer, basketball, volleyball and track and field. Among elite squads and among elite athletes in some sports, the proportion of international students to student-athletes is much higher than 4 percent, and that's an issue.

The third background issue is one that has occupied the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee on occasion over the past few years—the issue of the failed professional. Under NCAA regulations, an athlete who indicates an intent to professionalize has forever forsaken NCAA eligibility—the high-school baseball senior gets drafted in the 50th round, signs a contract, goes to Florida instructionally and finds out after a month he simply isn't capable of playing professional baseball. That athlete is forever unable to participate in NCAA athletics. That's a background issue that has been looked at as well.

There are also some issues that the project team has investigated as we've been going through our study of this. The first is problems inherent in the definition of amateurism. A second is inequitable treatment of prospective student-athletes. A third question is are we unnecessarily restricting the opportunities for our prospective student-athletes and for our student-athletes? I will look at each of those a little bit as we go along.

A quick background for those of you who do not know or aren't

familiar with how the student-athlete reinstatement process works. If a prospective student-athlete or student-athlete commits a violation of Bylaw 12, which is the amateurism legislation, that student-athlete is declared ineligible. If the institution believes that there is justification for reinstatement of eligibility, they will request eligibility reinstatement from the NCAA, which will go to the student-athlete reinstatement staff.

In looking at reinstatement, the student-athlete reinstatement staff and the committee look at the concept of intent to professionalize. This language is not in the bylaws; nevertheless, it is the guiding principle that we use when we determine whether or not a student-athlete should be reinstated. If a student-athlete has committed a minor and inadvertent violation of Bylaw 12, there is no reason why that student-athlete should be ruled forever ineligible to participate in Division II athletics.

On the other hand, if the student has indicated by his or her actions that he or she clearly intended to professionalize, that student-athlete will not be reinstated. This principle leads to inequitable treatment of sports. It also can lead to difficulties in consistently applying the principles.

Let's look at how we treat sports under this guideline. If a prospective student-athlete is in a sport where he or she has to declare eligibility for a draft in order to be drafted, the fact that that student-athlete or prospective student-athlete has declared his or her eligibility or put themselves on a draft list, renders them permanently ineligible. However, a student-athlete who is in a sport where you can be drafted without declaring for the draft retains eligibility. The intent of the student-athletes, however, may be identical.

For example, take a prospective soccer student-athlete. In order to be drafted by a particular professional league, he must put his name on a draft list. He does so, and even if he is not drafted, he is permanently ineligible under NCAA regulations because he has indicated his intent to professionalize. The baseball prospective student-athlete, on the other hand, can be drafted by a major league team, can negotiate a contract and providing he does not utilize an agent in that negotiation process and does not sign the contract, suffers no eligibility consequences. Yet, if we look at the intent of both student-athletes, it was probably identical. The intent was to assess the market value and make an informed decision about whether or not it was in their best interest to be a professional or to pursue a college athletic and academic career.

Additionally, there is a problem in consistently applying the standards. The problem occurs most clearly when we look at the difference between the situation of domestic student-athletes as opposed to international student-athletes. In the United States, there is a fairly clear demarcation system differentiating amateurism or amateur athletics and professional athletics. We have high-school athletics and we have college athletics, which are clearly amateur. We have

professional leagues that are clearly professional.

In many other countries of the world, this distinction does not exist. In many of the countries of the world, athletics do not occur—there is no athletics in high school and college. Athletics occur in a club system. In a particular club system, you can have a wide range of teams. The very lowest-level team would be clearly amateur by our standard. The very highest-level team would be clearly professional.

The problem that this causes in terms of applying the standard is that because the demarcation is fairly clear in the United States, we assume that domestic student-athletes know the eligibility consequences of their actions.

On the other hand, because the international system is much less clear cut, international student-athletes may not know the eligibility consequences of his or her actions. As a result, when we apply the standard of the intent to professionalize, we may say the domestic student-athlete took a particular action because he is a domestic student-athlete and because of the clear demarcation in this country between amateur and professional; that the domestic student-athlete knew he was risking his eligibility, he intended to professionalize, he is, therefore, ineligible.

The international student-athletes, however, because they are not aware and because the system is less clear cut, may not have had the same intent to professionalize. It makes it difficult in student-athlete reinstatement for us to consistently apply the standard.

Another area in which there is an inequity in our standards of amateurism lead to inequitable opportunities to capitalize on athletic ability. If you are a football or basketball player with professional potential, the opportunity to capitalize on your athletic ability, with a very rare exception of the Kobe Bryant, who goes directly from high school, is going to occur after graduation from college or at least after collegiate enrollment.

On the other hand, there are sports in which the opportunity to capitalize on your athletic ability, the opportunity to make money occurs while you are young. This is typically the case. Typical examples are gymnastics and swimming. What happens, therefore, is that our system indeed subsidizes the football and basketball student-athlete and allows that student-athlete to develop his or her skills that they can then use to make money at a professional level while it prohibits student-athletes in sports, such as gymnastics and swimming, from being able to capitalize on their athletic ability and participate in intercollegiate athletics.

I have a couple of comments about the latter types of sports. One is that these are the sports ironically that typically require the greatest investment on the part of the student-athlete and his or her family in order to become proficient. It typically costs a lot more to become a world-class gymnast than it does to become an NCAA all-American football player. The families have to make a greater investment, yet they are unable to capitalize on that investment.

A second factor is a gender-related one. The types of sports that our female student-athletes have the greatest opportunity to capitalize on have tended to be those where the opportunity to capitalize on athletic ability occurs while you're young. We are seeing now professional basketball leagues for women. But by and large—gymnastics is the perfect example of a sport for women—the opportunity to capitalize on your athletic ability is going to occur while you are still in high school or in some cases before you go to high school. In the NCAA, we prohibit you from doing that and then becoming a college athlete, but we encourage it in the other sports where we allow you to be a college athlete first and then become a professional.

This leads us finally to the issue or the collaboration upon the project team themes and the project team principles that President Sessoms referred to earlier. There are two basic themes that we are looking at that were guiding our deliberations. One is student-athlete welfare and the other is competitive equity. These are not, however, distinct themes.

Competitive equity is indeed a student-athlete welfare issue. If you are a student-athlete and you are competing against other student-athletes who for whatever reason have an advantage that is not directly due to differences in athletic ability, there is competitiveness inequity. This impacts directly upon your student-athlete welfare.

But if we look at student-athlete welfare, our primary consideration is going to be what's best for the student-athlete. When we look at competitive equity, what we want to look at is what factors lead to competitive inequity. What factors, therefore, lead to a competitive advantage and how can we address those factors?

To summarize the section of what we've been looking at: How can we deregulate the amateurism legislation to give our prospective and enrolled student-athletes more opportunities, more chances to choose what is best for them while at the same time recognizing that these additional opportunities that we provide them may lead to competitive advantages? How can we address the question of competitive advantage while still providing our potential or prospective student-athletes and our student-athletes with increased opportunities? I will now turn it over to Lisa, who will discuss our thinking along these lines.

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Consultant): Thank you, Tony. As you can see in the themes and principles that are in one question, what factors lead to a competitive advantage? There is one factor that the project team determined in its analysis that does lead to a competitive advantage—and that is actual competition.

The project team formulated a seasons-of-competition rule that is hopefully going to be used to address any competitive advantage that could be gained. Under this rule, after the summer following high-school graduation, if a prospect engages in organized competition, then they will be charged with a season of competition for every year of organized competition in which he or she participated.

Also, they must fulfill an academic year in residence upon enrollment. Let me give you an example of this. If a prospect engages in two years of organized competition following high-school graduation, and then they decide to enroll in an NCAA institution, they would then have 10 semesters in which to compete in two seasons of competition, they would be charged with a loss of two seasons of competition.

They would also have to fulfill an academic year in residence before they could begin competing in those two years that they have left. There are many reasons that the project team likes this seasons-of-competition rule. One is that it does directly address competitive advantage. As you'll see as we go along in some of the other areas that we'd like to deregulate, one of the problems is we've never been able to have a way in which to address competitive advantage. This is one way that we can do it.

Another is that the academic year in residence shows a commitment to academics on the part of the institution. We want to have you here at an institution for a year making satisfactory progress and then you'll be able to compete. It also demands a commitment on the part of the prospect that they also have that commitment to education and are willing to fulfill that academic year in residence before they are able to take advantage of their two seasons in that example.

Finally, one of the other nice parts to this is that we finally will allow prospects to make more informed decisions. If you deregulate other portions of Bylaw 12 and have the seasons-of-competition rule in place, then prospects will understand that if I engage in A, B or C for a certain length of time, I know what the consequences of that will be. No longer will it be a guessing game or an uninformed choice of having to go to the reinstatement staff and finding out what the consequence will be for certain behavior. The prospect is able to make an informed choice. Also, coaches will know exactly what eligibility will be remaining for those individuals who they'll be recruiting.

Once you have a mechanism in place to address competitive advantage, then the project team began to look at what other areas we can now start to deregulate if we can address a competitive advantage question.

The first topic that they tackled was the area of prize money. It probably should be no surprise that that would be one of the first areas, because money is intertwined in our notion of amateurism and seems to be the biggest hurdle to get over.

As the project team looked at prize money, they looked at the impact of prize money and began to evaluate that. They began looking at the flow of money and the concept that somehow if you get money you have now become a professional. Yet, if we ask you to return the money, you are now somehow an amateur. That was the example of how we've never really addressed the competitive advantage that could come with the actual competition that went along with getting that prize money.

Also, does acceptance of prize money itself somehow increase athletic skill or is it something else? Is prize money connected to competitive advantage? Also, if prize money were acceptable, would your pool of prospects change? The project team took a long time in deliberating on this one and concluded that they really didn't think that it would—that you have the same student-athletes out there with the same abilities. It's just that some of those individuals may now be able to accept prize money. Accepting the prize money doesn't increase their skill.

Finally, one of the final questions that we kept looking at was there a justification for denying prize money? We kept asking ourselves that. The project team asked other groups to give us any justification. We've yet to come up with a clear rational or understandable justification for denying prize money.

We are going to take a look at two student-athlete reinstatement cases. They're actual cases. They will illustrate how the current rules apply in processing a case involving the acceptance of prize money.

In the first case, the prospect received \$207 in prize money for participation in numerous tennis events and was reinstated based on repayment.

In the second case, a nonrecruited walk-on freshman received a cash prize of \$90 in a country club golf tournament. He was also reinstated based upon repayment.

As you keep those two cases in mind, we can go back to prize money and the themes. Why do we deny this opportunity with prospects? Most importantly, how does returning the prize money somehow change the athletes and then make it appropriate to be at our institutions and in our programs? As you can see, we just require repayment.

As for competitive equity, what competitive advantage was gained by receiving the money? If the competitive gain was gained by the actual competition, how do we address that? Again, you are going to hear us go back to the seasons-of-competition rule throughout this presentation.

If along with receiving prize money you competed for an extended period of time, you are going to be subject to the seasons-of-competition rule once you initially enroll. So we have the mechanism in place to address that issue. The consensus of the project team, as you can probably guess, is to allow individuals to accept prize money prior to collegiate enrollment.

The next topic is involvement with the professional draft and a contract. We really have the same issues and concerns in this area. Again, does one gain a competitive advantage by entering the draft or signing a contract? Do those acts themselves somehow give you better athletic skill? We have two actual cases to illustrate the application of current legislation. A prospect signed a minor league contract to play professional baseball. After just four days, they with-

drew from the team. They received no compensation and the contract that they did sign was never submitted or approved by Major League Baseball. Their eligibility was not reinstated.

As Tony mentioned earlier, the analysis is the intent to professionalize. Obviously, signing a contract indicates the intent to professionalize and that individual was not reinstated. In the second case, a student-athlete from Ukraine placed his name on the National Hockey League's player draft list. The prospect was not drafted and did not sign any contract with the professional organization. On appeal, the Division II Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement determined that he should be reinstated after the young man was withheld from competition during his first two years of residence at an NCAA member institution and charged with the loss of two seasons of competition.

There is really two points to be illustrated with these cases. One is that both of the prospects did not gain any competitive advantage by the actions that they undertook; yet, they received very significant penalties. The other thing to note is that there is an inconsistent or what seems to be inconsistent application of our legislation. One individual was permanently ineligible. The other individual lost two seasons. So again, that illustrates the inconsistency that we have in applying our current legislation.

With drafts and contracts, going back to our themes, are these athletes inappropriate for NCAA participation simply because they were drafted or because they signed a contract? That's the first question.

The next question comes to competitive equity. The project team realizes that if a prospect is successful in being drafted or successful in negotiating a contract with a team, then obviously some organized competition will follow from those acts. Do we have a way to address that if it should occur? The answer is "yes," we have the seasons-of-competition rule that would then address their actual competition.

The project team again and again goes back to the analysis of the competitive advantage that is gained, rather than the intent of the individual. Again, the consensus of the project team is that prior to collegiate enrollment, an individual may enter the draft and be drafted or sign a contract with a professional team.

I'll now turn to Julie Roe-Sumner to continue with the deregulation proposals.

Julie Roe-Sumner (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Lisa. Lisa just finished talking about draft contracts and she talked about the competitive equity core value and how it compares to that. Now, we can move into what we call the fun parts—competition for professionals and pay for play. It's interesting to note because with competition with professionals there is going to be an obvious competitive advantage gained if you are competing on the professional level. The project team has talked about that and we'll address that.

Let's go to a couple of cases. We just have two involving competi-

tion with professionals that we'd like to go over. The first involves a golf prospective student-athlete. He participated in nine golf tournaments as a professional. After he competed in these nine tournaments, the golf association reinstated his status as an amateur. Then he went to an institution and wanted to get his amateur status reinstated by the NCAA.

As you've heard, the analysis that we undertake is to determine whether or not the prospective student-athlete exhibits an intent to professionalize. Really, the key here is that he registered as a professional in order to participate in these tournaments. Because of that action, he demonstrated a very clear intent to professionalize. So because of that, he was not reinstated.

In the second case, we have a prospective student-athlete who participated as an amateur for 15 months on a professional basketball team. He did not sign a contract. He only received actual and necessary expenses. He was reinstated after being withheld from just 10 percent of a season.

I think it's interesting to compare these two cases because you have one prospective student-athlete who registered as a professional and showed an intent to professionalize. Then you have another prospect who actually was a lot wiser. He didn't sign a contract and therefore he didn't show any intent to professionalize. He also didn't accept any salary for that competition.

But when you look at the two cases, one could argue pretty easily that 15 months of professional competition can yield a much higher competitive advantage than nine golf tournaments. When you look at the two cases in the context of the core values and student-athlete welfare, should failed professionals such as this golf prospective student-athlete be excluded from Division II programs or should we focus more on competitive equity? How can the competitive advantage gained be evaluated and addressed?

Again, you insert the seasons-of-competition rule. Let's take, for instance, that golf student-athlete. He competed, let's say, for a calendar year the summer following high-school graduation in those nine tournaments. Therefore, if you apply the seasons-of-competition rule, he would be charged with a season of eligibility. So upon collegiate enrollment, he would only have three seasons left and he would fulfill an academic year in residence.

Therefore, you probably saw this coming, the consensus of the project team with regard to competition with professionals was to deregulate this area and allow individuals to compete as professionals prior to collegiate enrollment.

The next and final area of analysis that the project team examined was pay for play. You might be thinking that we've already talked about prize money as one form of pay for play and you are correct. But in the project team's analysis, they pulled prize money out to basically start the discussion, because prize money was an easier subject to get their arms around. When they realized there are many

other forms of pay for play such as salary, stipends and educational grants, they wanted to address that issue as well. They went back to those same questions of what is it about the acceptance of money that makes student-athletes inappropriate for our programs. Let's look at a case.

This prospective student-athlete signed a contract to play pro basketball. He received just under \$7,000 for a salary to be employed by a team for one year. He was not reinstated for two reasons—he signed a contract with a pro team and he also accepted a salary for a year. When you look at this case—and we have other cases like this at the Division II level—in the context of those core values for student-athlete welfare, the project team asked the question: Does acceptance of money actually change this prospect or was it the competition? Although \$7,000 does seem like a large amount of money, in reality, \$7,000 isn't going to be enough to allow a person to live on for a year.

When they looked at competitive equity, he did play for a year with this pro team. There was some sort of an advantage. How can we address that? Again, that's where you insert the seasons-of-competition rule to address that competitive advantage gained.

The consensus of the project team with regard to pay for play is that prior to collegiate enrollment, they want to deregulate this area.

Before we open it up for discussion, there are a couple of key questions that the project team wanted to share with you that they asked themselves during our analysis and questions that they've heard from other groups. The first is what about the nontraditional student-athlete? That's really a key component of the Division II philosophy. Will deregulation exclude any of these nontraditional student-athletes? The project team doesn't think that it will. In fact, deregulation allows for participation and more activities. The seasons-of-competition rule only applies to a person if they participate at a high level of organized competition. The project team does not want to have an impact on those individuals who participate in local church leagues or YMCA competition, they don't want the seasons-of-competition rule to apply to those situations.

Is this deregulation going to encourage some folks to go ahead and try their ability at the next level rather than enrolling in a collegiate institution? The fact is—you have seen some examples—that this is already occurring. Those are the failed professionals who the reinstatement committee often has to look at. They are heart-breaking scenarios at times.

The project team thinks deregulation would actually open the door to embrace those athletes who want to become student-athletes. In the Kobe Bryant scenario, a person who completes high school and then jumps to the professional level, the project team thinks that person wanting to come back down to the college level if deregulation were to occur is very unlikely. In the big scope of things, for someone who is at that caliber and level, the incentive to come back to a colle-

giate institution is not very high if they would have to give up that high salary and all those benefits.

Another key question is what about the percentage of older student-athletes who are dominating competition? The project team has talked at great length about age and origin of birth. Are those factors that yield a competitive advantage? They don't think that those are factors that do; but rather, the competitive experiences that a prospect brings to the table upon initial placement enrollment. That's why they think that the seasons-of-competition rule gets at that competitive advantage. With that, we'll turn it back over to President Sessoms to facilitate discussion.

Mr. Sessoms: I'd like to thank my colleagues for a brilliant and clear discussion. I'd like to ask Heather, Carol and Sue to come up—a student who participated actively in the discussions, an AD and a coach.

I'd like to take questions from the floor on any of those topics that we discussed.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): Lisa already heard my question before the Management Council. It relates to how we define high level of competition.

We have said today church leagues are out. In the American system—I'm an old tennis coach—are we saying 4.0, 4.5, 5.0 in USTA tennis competition? What level is totally amateur and wouldn't trigger this? Is it 3.5 playing in a national tournament? Does 3.5 mean this person triggered? This applies to other sports, too, I'm just using tennis as an example.

I'm in favor of moving in this direction. I think we need to move in this direction. I think when we get to that, how do we determine with the international student exactly those issues, because you have an awful lot of those young folks who are competing on what we call the local club team. It may be a very high-level local club team. What sort of enforcement is there? I know we're trying to reduce worrying about these kinds of enforcement procedures, but I believe it does trigger some.

Mr. Sessoms: Thank you for the question. Let me ask Heather, since she's a tennis amateur, to comment on what she thinks about the whole issue and the organized competition.

Heather Andrews (Student-Athlete/Missouri Southern State College): I can just give you a brief rundown of how we feel on these issues. I don't know if it's going to help you so much as with the organized competition. That's still something we are looking at. Somebody may be able to capitalize on that for you.

But, as student-athletes, we do feel that it's important to look at Bylaw 12 and ensure that its text applies to situations that are going on in Division II today. We want to provide a level playing field among Division II athletics to ensure that our athletes are having a positive student-athlete experience. We also want to broaden the opportunity for a student-athlete to pursue athletics as a vocation while

not penalizing the traditional student-athlete who competes as an avocation. So we do feel the need for change to ensure competitive equity. The SAAC was pleased with the direction the project team is going, and we generally support these ideas. As far as your organized competition question, let me direct that to another panelist.

Julie Roe-Sumner (NCAA Staff): Actually, Lisa and I have talked about this. She's going to handle the details, but I just want to tell everybody that this question was not planned. We actually have a slide with some definitions of organized competition just for you.

Lisa Dehon (NCAA Consultant): We'll pay you later for this question. We've talked about this question as part of the project team. Obviously, as we've stated, we don't want church leagues and YMCAs to be involved in this, but we also recognize there are other systems out there in the world. There needs to be a way that we consistently apply our definition to all sports. It's a work in progress. We are continually changing this. This would be a definition of organized competition that would pertain only to the seasons-of-competition rule. The other organized competition legislation in the Manual would remain the same. What we're trying to do in this definition is to catch those high levels of competition.

As you can see, we have competition in which compensation is provided to any participants and we've included the covering of actual and necessary expenses. As you mentioned, in the international systems in the club teams, this is typically what you see. They cover actual and necessary expenses as a way to participate on these teams.

Another one would be pursuant to signing a contract or being drafted, any competition that is funded by professional sports organizations excluding not-for-profit organizations. Finally, competition that is funded by a representative of an institution's athletic interest. This is in there because we don't want any sort of recruiting advantages or any type of interference where individuals could set up some sort of organized competition as a way to funnel students to certain institutions.

This is what we've come up with so far. We would love any suggestions by anybody if there is something we're missing, if we are going to miss a group of people with this definition or if we're going to catch people who we don't want to catch with this definition.

We've also discussed—it's not up here—the Olympic question. Do we include Olympic participation as being subject to the seasons-of-competition rule? Right now, we're looking at a way to exclude Olympic competition from that so we encourage young people to participate in the Olympics and other games with our national governing bodies.

Ed Harris: Thank you. You are moving in the right direction.

Paul Ruddy (Lewis University): How are we going to track these international students? If my coach is recruiting a 24-year old

international soccer player, is he going to take a form with him and say fill this out and tell me what you've done since you graduated from high school? If he says I haven't done anything, I haven't played on any teams, is that in there? How are we going to track these people and who is going to do it?

Ms. Roe-Sumner: Thanks for that good question. Actually, we talked about that with SAAC yesterday. One of the student-athletes asked if this seasons-of-competition rule were adopted, what's the realistic implementation of it? A couple of things that we've talked about is having the certifying officer at institutions certify a student-athlete's eligibility. When that student-athlete comes to campus, the first thing they do is look at when they graduated high school and determine if there has been a window of time between that high-school graduation and their collegiate enrollment. If so, then the next step is to ask what sort of activities they've engaged in during that time frame. There will be some work in determining how it meets the organized competition definition, but that will be part of the certification process.

The other part is the international student-athlete form that requires a person to list any competition that they've engaged in. Many of the types of competition listed would fall under the definition of the organized competition.

Ms. Dehon: One other advantage to this is that under our current legislation, we have to use the words "amateur" or "professional," so we have to fit a round peg in a square hole when it comes to international sports systems. Are they amateur? Are they professional?

A lot of times we have to rely simply on what they call themselves. They may look very professional to us, but in their country they call themselves amateur. We are no longer going to be hamstrung by having to use those terms. Instead, we just look at the actual competition. What did it look like? What did it involve and did it meet this definition?

Joseph R. Polak (New Hampshire College): To follow up on Paul Ruddy's question, it's very hard to prove negative if an international student or a domestic student says that they haven't played. Who do you write to find out? I think we are deregulating, which I think you've done a great job, but it seems like more work. Who do you write to to find out whether they did play?

Mr. Sessoms: Let me just comment on that and then ask Sue, who has looked at this probably from a different perspective, to comment.

Fortunately, people put their names up in lights on the Internet all the time. You can actually find people all over the world. If they competed in any organized sports, they are listed. If it's dubious that they've been out of school five years and they were doing nothing but growing potatoes during that time on their farm, one can actually verify some of that. But just using the fact that much more informa-

tion is available on all sorts of athletic competition worldwide, it gives you an opportunity to do some extra verification. Sue.

Suzanne Williams (University of California, Davis): We have discussed that at some length in our committee. It will operate much the way it has in the past regarding whether or not a person has accepted money for pay. The group feels, and I concur, that it's a lot easier to find out if someone participated and competed rather than whether or not they received money. Money is much harder to track. If a person competed, it's usually out there.

To answer your question more specifically about how a person, maybe a coach questioning whether or not an athlete from another team has participated, there are several routes you might follow. You might contact someone who you know in the international track competition community. There are Web sites and magazines that have meet results and competitive results that are sport specific. If you have reason to believe that an athlete competed, then you question their eligibility to the NCAA.

Joseph R. Polak (New Hampshire College): I understand that. You have to do that. But let's say it's an international student from Sweden and they played for a club in another part of Sweden. You would contact that area and maybe their city or the town or the province that they lived in. I think that would be the way you have to go. Why would you contact another town in another part of the country. I understand and think you would have to do those things, but it's just very difficult to prove a negative. You can check a positive. They said they did play. Then it's very easy to check. How many years, whether they got paid and a lot of the things you've gone over. But it's very hard to check a negative—even using the Internet. It's very hard to find out where to start.

Ms. Williams: I agree. It's difficult now under our current regulation. I don't see it's wildly different. It's just that whether or not you competed, it's easier to get that once you start the process.

Mr. Sessoms: I think it will be easier because you don't have to worry about whether they got paid or not.

John A. Hogan (Colorado School of Mines): Where have you been presenting this concept? In general, what kind of reaction are you getting to this concept?

Mr. Sessoms: I will turn that to our presenters and then comment on things that happened today.

Ms. Roe-Sumner: We presented this to the Management Council. We did that at the October meeting. We received a favorable response—that we were moving in the right direction. That was the only general response that we really were given other than some tough questions that were asked earlier.

We presented to the Division II SAAC yesterday morning. As Heather just indicated, SAAC supports the change and the fact that we are moving in a new direction. This morning, we presented to the Presidents Council. They actually reacted very favorably to it.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): We also presented in November to the Faculty Athletic Representatives Association, Division I and Division II, and then we had separate sessions. The reaction was quite positive. We anticipate that in the next several months, we're going to be making similar presentations to other constituencies in Division II.

We are still in the process of developing the final recommendations and trying to get feedback from the membership. If you have feedback, you can contact President Sessoms, you can contact the staff, you can contact anybody who is on the committee. We will be meeting again, probably during the last week in February. We are continuing to solicit input on this and we're still in that phase.

Ms. Roe-Sumner: There is actually one other group we presented to—the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee. It also supported the direction. Also, as Tony said, we're going to be presenting at the regional compliance seminars. There will be a Division II session, so we encourage you all to attend and talk to us with your questions at that time as well.

Melvin R. Ramey (University of California, Davis): What is the thinking that goes with the enlisted personnel in our armed forces who participate in athletics?

Mr. Sessoms: It's our expectation that the armed forces would be exempt.

Gerald Beer (California State University, Los Angeles): What's wrong with the idea of the clearinghouse making a determination of seasons of competition since this is an initial-eligibility matter?

Ms. Dehon: I think it's a resource issue of the individuals who need to be involved in doing that. One of the other components in determining whether a prospect has been involved in organized competition prior to initial enrollment is putting it back on the prospect in the international student-athlete statement. The project team has talked about putting some new questions in there for the athletes to answer and also making it clear that they have to answer truthfully. It could be subject to Bylaw 10.3—unethical conduct—should they provide misinformation.

Also, we could ask them to provide more information in the student-athlete statement so when they sign that they are informed that they need to provide that information to their institution. If they are an international student-athlete, we've also discussed the possibility of someone outside of the athletics department sitting down with that individual and discussing the statement with them so there is no question about terms that are used and no confusion in what we understand a word to mean or what they may understand a word to mean within their system. So there are some other ways that we can do that. Actually, the project team has not discussed whether a clearinghouse would be feasible, although it would be extremely nice if that could happen. Right now it would be nice.

Mr. Sessoms: Thank you very much.

CLOSING REMARKS

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): Let's give the project team a hand. (Applause.)

Thank you for your attendance and participation. I would also like to thank all of the guest speakers and the panels. Thank you very much.

☐ Division II Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 2000

The Division II business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Division II Presidents Council Chair Gladys Styles Johnston, University of Nebraska at Kearney, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Gladys Styles Johnston (University of Nebraska at Kearney): Good morning everyone. The 2000 business session of Division II will come to order. I'm Gladys Styles Johnston, chancellor at the University of Nebraska at Kearney and chair of the Division II Presidents Council and the Rocky Mountain Athletic Association.

This is really an historical event. On all our campuses, we've been talking about whether it's the turn of the century or is it the millennium. It's not the new millennium, but it's still historic that we are still standing in the year 2000.

I would like to introduce the other individuals joining me on the dais today. Please welcome Larry Fitzgerald, faculty athletics representative, Southern Connecticut State University, who is serving as our parliamentarian. Don Lubbers, chief executive officer, Grand Valley State University, Presidents Council vice-chair. Also, we have representatives from the NCAA staff, Mike Racy, a very able chief of staff for Division II. Jan Brown, assistant chief of staff for Division II. Ruth Reinhardt, executive assistant for Division II. Jim Johnson and Bob Oliver of the NCAA membership services staff. They will serve as our experts if any interpretations come up during the course of the day. Rebecca McCurdy, governance staff intern. Randy Buhr, membership services, and David Pickle, The NCAA News.

I have a few announcements that we need to make. Let me call to your attention two Convention publications. The first one is the Convention Program. The second is a copy of today's business session program. Throughout the meeting, I will ask you to refer to these two documents.

In Appendix A, the blue pages of the Official Notice, you will find a list of 47 legislative proposals that will be considered during the business session. We will attempt to follow the business session schedule as it is listed on pages 12 and 13 of the Convention Program.

We will recess not later than noon today for lunch and will conclude our business and adjourn this session no later than 5 p.m. today. One change that I do suggest is that we reconvene from lunch at 1 p.m. instead of 1:30. Since the rooms for the delegates lunch are so close to this meeting, and we have such an ambitious legislative agenda today, we need to be very efficient in our voting if we hope to get through all of the proposals. Also, I'd like for you to note on pages 4 and 5 of the Convention Program that there are minor cor-

rections to some of the Division II proposals. These are technical revisions that do not alter the original intent of the sponsors. One of the official procedures that we must dispense with is the need to adopt the Convention Notice and the Convention Program before the beginning of our business. If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order in which they appear in these publications. If you wish to move to reorder a proposal, now is the time to do so. I also want to point out that by adopting the Official Notice, you are adopting the incorporation of the interpretations described in Appendix B, the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix C and the intent-based amendments in Appendix E. These interpretations and amendments all have been approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council. We will not discuss any of them individually unless you move to do so. I would now ask for a motion to adopt the Official Notice and the printed program of this Convention so that we may proceed with our work. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

[Note: Convention voting procedures were explained.]

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT

Now moving on, I'd like to give you a report at this time for the Division II Presidents Council. I would like to take a few minutes to summarize these in the essence of time. This report is only a summary of Presidents Council action; however, The NCAA News publishes the actual minutes of each Presidents Council meeting, thus informing you in a timely fashion of all Presidents Council actions. Those minutes appeared in the following issues of the News: on March 29, July 5, October 11, and December 20.

When considering the Presidents Council's major involvement in 1999, I would like to highlight a few of our major accomplishments. The Presidents Council has overseen the implementation of the Division II strategic plan. Constitution 4.3.2 specifies that the Division II Presidents Council has responsibility for establishing a strategic plan for Division II. At last year's Convention, the Presidents Council highlighted results from a Division II survey regarding major issues facing our membership, and the Presidents Council pointed out the priorities that were identified by Division II chief executive officers and Division II athletics administrators. The Presidents Council was struck by how similar these priorities were for both groups.

From these survey results, a Division II strategic plan was developed. In November, the final version of the strategic plan was mailed to the Division II membership. In a few minutes, we will receive a report from Don Lubbers, chair of the Strategic Planning Project Team.

In 1999, the Presidents Council approved a unique initiative to enhance diversity in the Division II membership. A strategic alliance matching-grant program has been implemented, and the Presidents

Council has committed \$750,000 over the next three years to finance institutional programs that are designed to enhance diversity. Grant applications are due February 6, and I encourage every Division II school and conference to seriously consider this program.

In 1999, the Presidents Council approved a plan to begin consideration of bracket expansion for several Division II individual and team championships. Championships enhancement is a priority area for division budget decisions, and the Management Council and the Presidents Council anxiously await specific bracket and field size recommendations from the Championship Committee this spring.

In 1999, the Presidents Council managed the division budget in a way that has resulted in \$1.5 million of reserve for Division II and \$3 million of surplus money. This spring, the Division II Budget and Finance Committee will consider how the current and projected surplus money should be used in Division II. This discussion becomes even more crucial considering the Division's guaranteed allocation from the NCAA's new \$6 billion television deal with CBS.

In a few minutes, we will receive a report from the Division II Budget and Finance Committee. Much of the Presidents Council's time each year is spent reviewing specific recommendations from NCAA committees and managing the division affairs between Conventions. Those matters are all reflected in the printed minutes that I referenced previously. If there are issues regarding actions taken by the Presidents Council this year, I will be happy to entertain any questions that you may have.

Seeing no questions, that concludes the report from the Presidents Council for 1999. At this time, I'm going to ask Don Lubbers to come to the microphone to give the delegates a brief report on the Division II Strategic Plan.

STRATEGIC PLAN REPORT

Arend Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): The Division II Strategic Plan is a document that will guide the leaders of Division II during the next three years. You should have received a copy of the strategic plan in November. This morning, copies of the goals and priorities as set forth in the plan were distributed in each row.

As additional resources become available for our membership, the plan becomes critical in the development and long-range success for Division II. The plan took over one year to create and at every stage and with each draft of the plan, the membership was consulted to ensure that the goals and priorities are consistent with the Division II philosophy. It was quite striking to see almost consensus agreement in the priorities.

Division II has identified the following 10 priorities and objectives to focus on over the next three years: student-athlete welfare; championships; Division II finances; deregulation; Division II identity; rules compliance; diversity; enhancing the role of the FAR and the SWA in Division II; amateurism; and technology and communication.

Over the past year, Division II has accomplished many of its strategic initiatives. Let me mention a couple of these accomplishments: 11 legislative proposals to deregulate Bylaws 11 and 13 will be considered by the Division II membership later today; two, a strategic alliance matching enhancement program has been created to enhance gender and ethnic diversity in Division II and \$250,000 has been allocated for year one of this program.

As we move into the new year, here are some initiatives Division II will focus on. In the area of student-athlete welfare, the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council will implement the enhanced championship mementos program for Division II student-athletes and further review initiatives to enhance the Division II student-athlete championship experience. We'll also develop a plan to enhance the effectiveness of the institutional and conference student-athlete advisory committees in Division II; consider whether changes to Division II initial-eligibility standards are necessary; in the area of championships, the Management Council and Presidents Council will consider bracket and field size expansion in certain individual and team sports—foremost, volleyball, track, wrestling and lacrosse.

The financial picture in Division II is bright. During the next year, the Presidents Council and Management Council will consider ways to use unallocated Division II funds that currently exceed \$3 million. We'll also develop a plan to prioritize strategic initiatives as Division II projects its revenue share from the new CBS basketball contract and analyze the costs associated with operating Division II athletics programs and look for ways to help schools save money.

Division II will continue its efforts in the area of deregulation. This year, look for proposed legislation to deregulate Bylaw 15 at the 2001 Convention. In the summer of 2000, Division II will conduct a summit to consider the deregulation of Bylaw 17. As the NCAA public affairs staff prepares the NCAA public relations plan, Division II will work with the staff to develop specific key messages about Division II to incorporate into the plan. I think we all feel that the NCAA is so often identified with Division I that the rest of us get lost, and we would like to remedy that.

In the area of rules compliance, the main priorities in 2000 are to review and implement the Compliance Review Project Team's plan to develop Division II specific compliance tools and resources. This would be the first time compliance services have been developed to address the compliance needs unique to Division II institutions. The Division II Management Council and Presidents Council will also focus on ways to increase Division II's use of current NCAA compliance services.

Diversity continues to be a priority in our division. As the Strategic Alliance Matching Enhancement Grant Program begins to address diversity at the institutional and conference level, Division II will begin to look at alternatives and initiatives that will enhance diversity within the Division II governance structure.

Another priority in 2000 is enhancing the role of the FAR and the

SWA. In 2000, the Division II Presidents Council and Management Council will review action plans submitted by the Committee on Women's Athletics and Faculty Athletics Representatives Association to enhance the SWA and the FAR positions in Division II.

In 2000, we will continue to review the amateurism issue. The Division II Amateurism Project Team will continue to educate the Division II membership concerning Division II amateurism issues. Also, the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council will consider possible legislation at the 2001 Convention that would modify current Division II amateurism rules.

Finally, in the area of technology and communications, Division II will appoint a staff project team to assess the Division II membership's current technological and communication capabilities and gather suggestions regarding Division II technology and communication enhancements.

As you can tell, we have a full agenda for the upcoming year. However, we know that our work does not stop in 2000. In the distant future, the Management Council and Presidents Council will also review the current Division II transfer and continuing-eligibility requirements to determine if changes should be proposed. We will create models to assist in promoting the academic success of Division II student-athletes, and we will also consider establishing a marketing and promotions plan for Division II championships.

The Division II Management Council and Presidents Council welcome your feedback concerning the direction of Division II and we encourage you to contact Mike Racy or Jan Brown at the national office with your comments. That concludes my report. Thank you.

Ms. Styles Johnston: Thank you very much, Don. I'd just like to take a moment to compliment Don for his leadership in guiding the strategic planning committee in consultation with Asa Green, as well as an able NCAA staff in Division II that was able to really articulate and understand what we were trying to say and make some sense out of it. So Mike and Jan, I want to thank you so much for your leadership in bringing this together. Give them a round of applause, please. (Applause)

I would like to ask Clint Bryant, director of athletics at Augusta State University and chair of the Division II Management Council, to give a report on the work of the Division II Management Council. To members of the Management Council, you need to know that Clint, on behalf of the Division II membership is very, very effective in his leadership of bringing concerns for the Management Council effectively to the Presidents Council. He can be very persuasive in representing your views.

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL REPORT

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): Thank you, Chancellor Johnson. As chair of the Division II Management Council, I'm pleased to stand before the delegates this morning to highlight, and

even brag about, the 1999 accomplishments of the Division II Management Council.

Before I take a few minutes to highlight some of the major issues that the Management Council reviewed this past year, I would like to recognize some very special people in Division II. First, I would like to recognize everyone who chairs a Division II general or sports committee. If you would please stand. Join me in recognizing these people. (Applause)

I'd like to give special recognition to Barb Schroeder, the chair of our Championship Committee; Paul Englemann, the chair of the Legislative Committee; Penny Clayton, chair of Membership; Jim Fallis, chair of Nominating; Kevin Listerman, chair of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee; Mary Lisko, from Augusta State University, who chairs the Academic Requirements Committee; Tony Capon, who chairs the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee; and Les Brinson, who chairs the Committee on Infractions.

Secondly, I would like for everyone in Division II who serves on an Association-wide committee to stand. If you serve on any of these committees, please stand. Join me in showing our appreciation to these people. (Applause.)

I would like to give special recognition—they didn't stand when I asked them to—to our Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Stand and be recognized. These kids do a great job. Unbelievable. (Applause)

Finally, I would like to recognize a very special Division II student-athlete. As many of you know, Division II was honored at the NCAA Woman of the Year awards ceremony this past fall when a Division II student-athlete from the University of California, Davis, received the highest honor that the NCAA gives to a female student-athlete. Jamila Demby has been on the honor roll for UC Davis from 1995 to 1999 and was the 1995-96 recipient of the Bloss Scholarship. Jamila was an indoor track and field all-American in 1998 and '99; and in the outdoor track and field, she received all-American status in 1996 through '99. She also took home the university women track and field most-inspirational award both in '96 and in '99. My introduction does not begin to capture the spirit of this special student-athlete. We have a short video to present that was created following the awards ceremony, so sit back and enjoy.

[Note: The video was played.]

Mr. Bryant: Quickly, let me highlight some of the major accomplishments with the Management Council in 1999.

As Chancellor Johnston said, the Division II Management Council minutes can be found in the following issues of the News, March 29, July 5, October 11 and December 20.

As you have heard, Division II now has a three-year strategic plan. The Management Council worked with the Strategic Planning and Project Team and the Presidents Council to develop a plan that

focused on issues important to the Division II membership. I am pleased with the way that this project has turned out.

Regarding the diversity grant, the Division II Management Council has worked with the Division II Presidents Council to develop a grant program to enhance diversity representation in the Division II membership.

Division II has to take a bold step in this approach to address the diversity issue. The Management Council and Presidents Council are committed to this approach and the other two divisions are monitoring our success. I encourage you to take advantage of this program by the February 6 deadline. You remember at last year's Convention, we put together a resolution in the Division II membership that adopted these ideas. Last fall, the Management Council gathered the chairs of the Division II general committees to meet with the chair and vice-chair of the Management Council. The purpose of this meeting was to review the division's first two years of operation in the new federated governance structure.

The group was asked to review the governance and legislative process as currently structured and to consider whether any changes are necessary. Specific recommendations will be reviewed this spring, and it is possible that legislation may be presented for the membership to consider at next year's Convention.

The Division II Management Council has established a project team that is reviewing the current tools and resources that are used for Division II compliance reviews. The project team has been asked to consider revising the compliance review process so that issues unique to Division II institutions can be adequately addressed. This is another area of regulation where Division II has taken the lead.

The Management Council considered numerous deregulation proposals last summer for the Division II legislative committee and agreed to bring forth 11 proposals to the Presidents Council to sponsor for membership consideration. We will consider these proposals with other legislation in the president's grouping. These proposals will be used as a barometer of the division's commitment to making Division II rules more consistent with our philosophy. Our efforts are being monitored closely by the other divisions. There are a lot of cynics out there who say deregulation will never happen. I disagree. I have faith that the Division II membership is ready to deregulate, and I encourage your support when these proposals are considered later today.

It is my pleasure now to introduce Paul Englemann, chair of the Division II Legislative Committee, to give a deregulation update.

DEREGULATION REPORT

Paul H. Englemann (Central Missouri State University): Good morning. My task is to provide a brief update of Division II deregulation efforts. The deregulation project, as you know, was established as a priority for the Division II membership by the Presidents

Council. It has now been incorporated into the Division II strategic plan that was recently distributed to the membership. You are seeing the finished product of the first phase of that project today in the form of proposed amendments to Bylaws 11 and 13.

The committee recently completed work on initial recommendations to deregulate Bylaw 15—financial aid. These concepts were reviewed by the Management Council and Presidents Council at the pre-Convention meetings. Work will begin this summer on discussions of concepts to deregulate the playing and practice season legislation in Bylaw 17.

The committee has focused on three goals as it worked its way through these first two years of deregulation. I would like to briefly share those goals with you.

First, simplify the application and understanding of Division II legislation. Second, reduce the amount of legislation included in the Division II Manual by eliminating legislation that is not consistent with the Division II philosophy or not necessary in Division II. We want a more user-friendly Manual. Third, simplify and/or reduce the monitoring activities that are necessary due to current legislation.

In keeping with these goals, there are 11 proposals before you today that significantly deregulate personnel and recruiting legislation. The committee hopes that you share in our belief that today is a landmark day in Division II. The deregulation effort makes this the most significant legislative session since restructuring legislation was considered in Dallas in 1996. Today, we can clearly demonstrate our belief in legislative autonomy and at the same time lead the Association as a whole in deregulating the NCAA Manual.

Furthermore, deregulation provides an opportunity to minimize legal risk by eliminating rules that arguably place the NCAA in a vulnerable legal position. There is legislation currently in Division II that fits this description that you will today have the opportunity to eliminate.

With that said, the committee believes there is a rule of thumb that sums up the deregulation philosophy, and we hope that you will keep this in mind when voting on deregulation proposals today and in future years. It was perhaps best stated by John Hogan, the faculty athletics representative at the Colorado School of Mines, at a recent FARA meeting. When hearing of the "dereg" proposals, John said: "It's time for Division II to limit its legislation to rules that apply to 99 percent of the Division II membership instead of having legislation that exists to close loopholes for 1 percent of the membership." We could not have said it better.

This past July, the second deregulation summit was held to discuss financial aid legislation. Participants represented the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the Faculty Athletics Representative Association, the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics, National Association of Athletics Compliance Coordinators, National Association of Student Financial Aid

Administrators, and the Division II Collegiate Commissioners Association. In November, the committee met, and using input from the summit, discussed several concepts for Bylaw 15 deregulation. I would like to briefly share these with you:

1. Eliminate restrictions on some athletically related financial aid. We believe that this can be sufficiently entrusted to institutional policy and discretion.

2. Eliminate restrictions regarding on-campus and off-campus employment; however, please recall the provisions of Bylaw 12.4.1 will continue to control the amount of money earned and work actually performed with regard to all student-athlete employment.

3. Redefine the 10-semester limitation on athletically related aid.

4. Revise restrictions on aid when the student-athlete is a professional in another sport.

5. Eliminate the employee-dependent tuition benefit and supplemental educational opportunities grant as countable aid.

6. Revise the definition and application of academic honor awards and honorary academic awards.

7. Revise the definition of a "countable." A "countable status" would be determined primarily by the receipt of athletically related aid and would allow recruited and nonrecruited student-athletes to be treated consistently.

8. Revise the countable status of a student-athlete who sustains a career-ending injury or illness during the first term of an academic year.

Please understand that these concepts are still in the discussion phase, and we still invite and encourage your input on these. Discussion on these and other ideas will continue throughout the spring and will be before you in legislative form next January in Orlando. Please take time to complete the deregulation suggestion sheets. All of you have one, if you want more, they will be made available to you. They are on your table, forward them to the national office. They can be related to Bylaw 15 or any of the other bylaws that we are going to be dealing with in the future. The committee sincerely needs and wants your input.

In closing, I would like to thank my colleagues who serve on the Legislation Committee and recognize them for their hard work and dedication on this project in addition to their regular efforts in conducting the business of the committee. Would you please stand and be recognized? Thank you.

In particular, I'd like to recognize Leon Kerry. Leon did an absolutely outstanding job in serving as the chair for our initial meeting on deregulation through this last August. Leon, thank you. Also, Will Shaw. Will has just completed his term on our committee. Will, we are going to miss your contributions, and we certainly appreciate all you have done for us, thank you very much.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you, Paul, for that great report. Just very briefly, I'd like to sum up the year. This has been one heck of a ride

for me. Probably the most satisfying thing I've ever done professionally is being chair of the Management Council, and I look forward to the next year.

Division II has met the restructuring and the federated process head-on with glowing enthusiasm and success. Our presidents are committed to leading and accepting their role, as evidenced in their participation at this Convention. For example, yesterday, we had close to 70 presidents at our CEO luncheon; 18 presidents, every president of the Gulf South Conference, are present at this Convention. That's great.

On a personal note, my president, William A. Bloodworth, has been at Augusta State University six years. He's never missed a Convention, and I'd like to tell him how much I appreciate that publicly.

I listened yesterday, as I'm sure you did, very intently to President Dempsey's State of the Association address. I couldn't agree more with his foresight, direction and course of the Association as we enter the new millennium, a new century. I don't know about you, but from where I sit, he may have been preaching to the choir. It is with great pride that I recognize that Division II has taken the issues facing the Association head-on as we become a model for the rest of the Association. We have begun the process to deregulate, and we'll get on with that later on in the day.

We talked yesterday about diversification. But I stand here in front of you knowing that we are the only division in which a person of color chairs both the Presidents Council and the Management Council.

Amateurism issue under the fine leadership of Allen Sessoms; I thought I was looking at Mark McGwire and Sammy Sosa yesterday—they were hitting home runs all over the place. I would like for the president to know that the train has already left the station in Division II. We stand here as living proof of what can be done in this Association if you actually and truly are committed to the vision.

We stand here today, not as passengers waiting to board or load the train, but sitting comfortably on the train. I would suggest, Mr. President, that Division II stands here today as architects of the rail line; that Division II is engineers of the system; that Division II is driving the train. We may not be providing the resources, but it's apparent that we are providing the leadership. Chancellor Johnston, that ends my report. Thank you.

Ms. Styles Johnston: Thank you very much, Clint. At this time, I'd like to ask Don Lubbers again to come back to the podium and give you a report from the Budget and Finance Committee.

BUDGET AND FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

Arend Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): Thank you, Gladys. These are going to be momentous months for the Division II Budget Committee. I would like to introduce the members of the committee and ask them to stand when I call their name so that you

can see them. I'm sure there are many of you who have strong opinions and ideas and these are the people to whom you should communicate them. Clint Bryant who was just here, Augusta State University; Charles Dunn, Henderson State University; Bernard Franklin, Virginia Union University; G. Jean Cerra, Barry University; Jerry Hughes, Central Missouri State University; Marvalene Hughes, California State University, Stanislaus; Gladys Styles Johnston, University of Nebraska at Kearney; and Barbara J. Schroeder, Regis University in Colorado. I believe you have some handouts, I refer you to them and to the transparency.

Division II revenue allocation totaled 12,200,000 plus dollars for the 1998-99 fiscal year; \$6.14 million was spent for Division II championships, a decrease of 10 percent for \$711,000 from the previous year. The decrease is mainly attributed to a decrease in travel costs for various Division II championships, specifically the Division II football championship travel decreased by \$439,000. So at least we're beginning to get a handle on the range of costs for championship travel.

A total of \$3 million was distributed as the Division II enhancement fund to the Division II membership; \$730,000 was contributed to the Division II membership trust. The remaining \$2.3 million was not allocated to a specific Division II program during 1998-99 and will be available for use this year or in the future.

The Division II membership trust has accumulated to \$1.3 million over the past two years. The Budget and Finance Committee will be discussing these funds and whether a target amount should be set for this membership reserve. We will be discussing this at our March meeting. The Division II unallocated funds have accumulated to \$3.1 million over the past two years. The Division II Budget and Finance Committee had decided during the 1998-99 fiscal year that it will continue to be conservative in regard to the use of unallocated funds to ensure that Division II will continue its strong operations.

However, this accumulation of unallocated funds over the past two years will be another agenda item for the March meeting and any recommendations for uses of these funds will be forwarded to the Division II Management and Presidents Council, that's why this is the time for your input.

Presently, the unallocated funds are used to support any Division II championship or other expenses that are over-budget. Division II revenue, as you can see, was \$12.7 million and the division expenses for championships was \$7.7 million and the enhancement fund was \$3 million. We have the diversity matching grant program and we have initiated a contingency fund of \$50,000. We never had a contingency fund before; it was always complicated to find the money for expenses that came about during the course of a year.

Then, of course, 5 percent has to be added to the Division II membership trust and the rest to unallocated funds that would be added to the \$3.1 million surplus. Because future additional costs are difficult to determine, the Division II Budget and Finance Committee will

continue to closely monitor the cost of the elimination of the geographic proximity policy. An amount of \$300,000 was added to the 1999-00 budget to cover the approximate costs associated with the policy change.

The policy change has already added approximately \$37,000 of the additional travel costs to the 1999 Division II volleyball championship. It will be very important to examine these increased expenses as decisions are made for the use of the current unallocated funds and projected surplus.

In November, the NCAA signed a new 11-year agreement with CBS for rights to televise the Division I men's basketball championship, other championships and marketing opportunities. The contract, beginning in 2002-03, has an option for the NCAA to renegotiate after eight years or continue through fiscal year 2013. Division II will maintain its 4.37 percent budget allocation, which will result in a projected 23 percent increase in revenue for 2002-03.

The new television rights agreement accounts for 20 percent of that increase with the additional 3 percent increase coming from other revenue projections. These projections represent an increase of revenue for Division II from \$14.5 million in 2001-02 fiscal year to \$17.9 million in 2002-03, a jump of \$3.4 million.

With this increased revenue, Division II will be able to analyze future requests for funding of Division II initiatives, which may include championships bracket expansion, programs specifically designed to assist with student-athlete welfare, programs designed to assist with the enhancement of diversity, and other programs in the Division II strategic plan.

The governance structure provides us many opportunities for Division II to enrich our student-athletes and a service that can be provided to our membership. Presidents feel it is crucial to study the issues and alternatives so that Division II provides prudent stewardship of its resources.

Feedback regarding this presentation or any Division II financial issues is welcome. Contact the people who stood up or any of the staff members.

As I look to this next few months of analyzing the resources and how we should use them, I think it will be important for us to predict the number of institutions and conferences that will be joining Division II in these coming years.

Personally, I think it is possible to predict quite accurately what that number will be, and then having made those predictions, what are the questions that must be asked. First, how much money to institutions directly? How much to conferences? How much to Division II initiatives that are in the strategic plan? How much to championships? How much to reserve funds? These are the issues that we will be taking up. By next Convention, I hope that we as a division can establish some precedence to our spending, and that we will establish our priorities for our spending and

move into this century in an enlightened and I hope enhanced way. Thank you.

Ms. Styles Johnston: Before considering Division II legislative proposals today, our first order of business is to ratify the individuals who were selected in 1999 to fill positions of the Division II Management Council. NCAA Convention Constitution 4.6.3.1.2 requires all Management Council selections to be ratified by the Division II membership at the NCAA Convention. This ratification is not a call for additional nominations, instead, it is a formal acceptance of the members of the Management Council as adopted by the Presidents Council. A chart detailing the composition of the Management Council was distributed this morning. Can I have a motion for ratification?

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

We will now begin our voting on the 47 Division II proposals stated on page 2 in the Official Notice. Proposal Nos. 2 through 12 are part of the consent package that is intended to be voted on as a group.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified Proposals Numbers 13 through 34 as those that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. After considering the Presidents Council grouping, we will consider the rest of the legislation beginning with Proposal 35. These proposals will be considered by paddle vote. Before we begin the actual voting, we would like to take time to review the voting units we are using today. I'm going to go over some procedures with you.

[Note: Voting procedures were explained.]

I'd also like to note that Proposal No. 11-A must be removed from the consent package and it will be considered after Proposal 23. If Proposal No. 23 is adopted, Proposal No. 11-A will be moot and thus it won't be necessary to conduct a vote. I recognize the individual at microphone two.

Consent Package

James W. Watson (West Liberty State College): On behalf of the Division II Management Council, I wish to move the adoption of the consent package.

[The motion was seconded.]

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I move that Proposals 8 and 9 be pulled for separate consideration.

[The motion was seconded and approved.]

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): I would ask that Proposal No. 10 be moved for separate consideration.

[The motion was seconded and failed.]

Ms. Styles Johnston: I see no one else at the microphone, so we are ready to vote on the original motion, which was to move Proposals 3 through 12 as a group as a part of the consent package, except for

11-A, which we will deal with later. This also is a paddle vote.

[The consent package was approved.]

We are now ready to move Proposals 13 through 34 that make up the presidents grouping. We must first vote on whether to establish immediate effective date for a proposal then vote on the proposal as amended to include an immediate effective date.

Yesterday, the Presidents Council decided that a roll-call vote to adopt an immediate effective date is not necessary. We will consider the effective date vote by paddle, although we will vote on the final adoption of Proposal No. 13 by roll-call vote.

Amendment Process—Emergency Legislation

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): As chair of the Academic Requirements Committee, I move for the immediate effective date of Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

Following the Cureton versus NCAA decision of early last year, it became apparent that Division II did not have the means to promptly respond to or comply with a court order for an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) or a government order.

Currently, the only means to respond to such a situation is through the annual Convention or through the provision of a special Convention. Proposal No. 13 will remedy the situation by permitting the Presidents Council to adopt emergency legislation in situations when the NCAA must respond to or comply with a court alternative dispute resolution or government order or when the Presidents Council deems it's necessary to limit or avoid NCAA liability as a result of litigation, ADR or government proceedings.

Adopting such legislation will require a three-fourths majority of the Presidents Council present and voting. Any legislation adopted under this emergency provision must be ratified by the Division II membership at the next regularly scheduled NCAA Convention. On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 13.

Kevin Hickey (Assumption College): Speaking as a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge the Convention support this proposal, which is sponsored by the Presidents Council.

This proposal would allow the Presidents Council to adopt emergency legislation in situations that Division II must respond to or comply with a court or government order or when the Presidents Council deems it appropriate to limit or to avoid liability as a result of litigation involving a Division II rule. Such authority is very limited in its scope and the Management Council and the Presidents Council recognize the responsibility to the membership if it is ever necessary to take such action. Speaking for the Management Council, we urge you to support Proposal No. 13.

Jessica S. Kozloff (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): I am speaking in support of Proposal 13 on behalf of the Presidents Council.

A number of court cases, as has already been mentioned, have taught us some very valuable lessons about the vulnerability of the NCAA in this very litigious—and I might add often plaintiff-friendly legal—environment. We believe it is vitally important that we have a mechanism to avoid liability and for swift action.

I want to stress, however, that the Presidents Council is also very sensitive to the concern that this power might be abused, and therefore you see the requirement for the two-thirds vote by the Presidents Council as well as a requirement for ratification by the next Convention. So on behalf of the Presidents Council, I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 13 (Page A-12) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Eligibility—Additional Season of Competition Waiver

Carol M. Dunn (California State University, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Division II Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement as well as the NCAA Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is designed to provide relief to the ineligible student-athlete who relies on the irresponsible action of a coaching staff member to enter a student-athlete into competition when the coaching staff member is unsure of the student-athlete's status and the student-athlete is subsequently determined to be ineligible.

Generally, it is a coaching staff member who wrongfully decides to allow a student-athlete to participate before the final determination of eligibility has been made. However, it is the student-athlete who suffers the harsh application of the legislation. The committee proposes to provide relief when warranted to a student-athlete in this situation. The committee notes that this proposal does not provide relief for the student-athlete who knowingly competes while ineligible.

Additionally, the institution as well as the coaching staff member will still be held accountable and penalized through the secondary infractions process for allowing an ineligible student-athlete to participate in competition. This proposal does not change the philosophy behind the current criteria of the season of competition waiver, but it does expand the circumstances that warrant relief.

The Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement and the Presidents Council believe the adoption of this proposal is a reasonable and appropriate accommodation for the student-athlete who follows the wrongful instruction of a coach to participate in competition. Thank you.

Albert J. Shannon (Saint Joseph's College, Indiana): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council, I urge you to support this proposal that is sponsored by the Presidents Council. The proposal is designed to provide relief to a student-athlete who relies erroneously upon the decision of a coaching staff member who allows the student-

athlete to compete even though final certification of a student-athlete's eligibility has not occurred. In cases like this, it should be the institution and the coach that are penalized, not the student-athlete.

The Presidents Council supports this proposal as a way to further enhance student-athlete welfare in Division II. The Presidents Council urges your support for Proposal 14.

[Proposal No. 14 (Page A-13) was adopted, 164-42-2.]

Initial-Eligibility—Core-Curriculum Requirements

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Core-Course Review Committee, I move Proposal 15. [The motion was seconded.]

The current legislation that defines a core course has been in place for over 15 years and does not provide the flexibility to address integrated and interdisciplinary curricula used in many high schools. This has led to problems in school systems involving innovative educational approaches. The review of core-course content that crosses traditional disciplinary boundaries was a difficult task for the Core-Course Review Subcommittee.

Over the past several years, the NCAA Core-Course Review Committee has engaged in an ongoing dialogue with academic members of the secondary school community. This proposal is an outgrowth of these discussions and will ensure that the NCAA's core course keeps pace with reforms in secondary education.

The proposed changes to the definition provide the flexibility needed to appropriately administer the core-course review process without compromising standards. Consistent with the direction the committee received from the Division II Presidents Council, this proposal also gives high-school principals primary responsibility for evaluating high-school core-course offerings in relationship to the NCAA core-curriculum requirement.

I urge you to support the adoption of Proposal 15. Thank you.

Allen Lee Sessoms (Queens College, New York): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council, I urge your support for this important proposal that the Presidents Council has agreed to sponsor.

The Division II Presidents Council is committed to giving high-school principals primary responsibility for evaluating high-school courses to determine if innovative educational initiatives are preparing prospective student-athletes for the academic challenges of college.

Relations between the high-school community and the NCAA clearinghouse have improved dramatically during the past few years. This proposal is another example of the NCAA and high-school representatives working together to accomplish the same goal—academic success. For these reasons, the Presidents Council encourages you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Pamela L. Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): As a former member of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge

your support for this proposal. This will continue our efforts to open relations with high-school principals, and the High-School Superintendents Association, and it will take the NCAA Academic Requirements Committee out of the core-course police department. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 15 (Page A-14) was adopted.]

Initial Eligibility—Core-Curriculum Requirements— Nontraditional Courses

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the NCAA Core-Course Review Committee, I move Proposal 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Core-Course Review Committee, during its ongoing review of courses, has noted a significant increase in the number of high-school courses taught using nontraditional methods. Current legislation often does not allow these courses to count in meeting the Division II eligibility standard, even though in many cases the courses are of significant academic rigor.

When the NCAA prohibition against independent study and correspondence courses was adopted over 15 years ago, it was unlikely that anyone could foresee the impact of technology on the delivery of education, including courses taught by distance-education technology via the Internet.

Discussions with the secondary school committee led to development of clear criteria that nontraditional courses must meet in order to be acceptable as core courses for initial-eligibility purposes. High-school principals must also attest in writing that a course meets these requirements.

In discussing this proposal, the committee believes that the membership goal of academic preparedness of student-athletes will not be compromised because of the safeguards that are included in the proposal. Thus, I urge your support of Proposal 16. Thank you.

Allen Lee Sessoms (Queens College, New York): I again rise to urge your support for the academic proposal that is being sponsored by the Division II Presidents Council.

Times change and so do the methods we use to deliver education. The Presidents Council recognizes the need to accept nontraditional classroom instruction as a way of preparing prospective student-athletes for the academic challenges of college.

The Presidents Council is comfortable with the safeguards that the committee has proposed; therefore, the Presidents Council encourages you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): As the chair of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee, I also urge you to support Proposal 16. Current legislation does prohibit the use of the innovative and oftentimes very good nontraditional forms of instruction such as the distance-learning Internet courses or courses taught by high-school individualized instruction.

The high-school agencies that have been referred to have also provided information regarding the quality and types of programs now offered on the Internet, individualized instruction and distance learning.

Based on the information that the Academic Requirements Committee has seen, and also based on the safeguards that we believe are in place with the proposed legislation, the Academic Requirements Committee believes that the courses offered through nontraditional delivery methods should be permissible to satisfy core-course requirements.

We do need to focus on the academic preparation of student-athletes rather than on the method of delivery of that preparation. The committee believes this legislative change is consistent with the current trends of the secondary education reform movement and that the prospective student-athletes who have enrolled in such courses will be academically prepared to succeed at a four-year collegiate institution.

On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 16.

[Proposal No. 16 (Page A-16) was adopted.]

Satisfactory Progress— International Baccalaureate Program Examinations

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): As the chair of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation permits student-athletes to use credit received through advance placement testing or through credit by examination to meet minimum satisfactory-progress requirements provided the institution offers the courses and awards degree credits in the subject for which the exam is an alternative.

Many Division II institutions are now beginning to use the exams offered through the International Baccalaureate Program. The belief is that the International Baccalaureate Program is a legitimate testing program. Furthermore, students must demonstrate mastery of the subject matter in order to receive acceptable scores on these exams. Student-athletes should be permitted to use credit received through the International Baccalaureate Program examinations to meet minimum satisfactory-progress requirements in the same manner as they received credit through the advanced-placement testing program.

On behalf of the Academic Requirements Committee, I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 17.

Patricia P. Cormier (Longwood College): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council, I urge your support of this proposal that the Presidents Council has agreed to sponsor.

Allowing students to use the International Baccalaureate Program to meet minimum satisfactory-progress requirements rec-

ognizes the growing usage of this program by Division II institutions and puts the program on the same level as advanced placement tests. This change makes sense for Division II.

For these reasons, the Presidents Council encourages you to vote in favor of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 17 (Page A-17) was adopted.]

Financial Aid—Board Allowance

Sharon E. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

In many instances, an institution's maximum board allowance published in its catalog is less than the equivalent of three meals a day.

Often, institutions contract out their dining services to outside entities that establish meal plans based on surveys showing how many meals students actually eat. The plans established are often fewer than a 7-day/21-meal plan.

Student-athletes attending such institutions may not receive meals sufficient to meet the nutritional demands of their participation in intercollegiate athletics. This proposal would address those needs of the student-athlete as well as promote competitive equity by ensuring that an institution's meal plan is not used as a recruiting tool when offering a prospect financial aid that covers the cost of meals. The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support for this proposal.

Ms. Styles Johnston: Before I recognize the next speaker, I'd like to remind you that an official interpretation of this proposal was distributed this morning and you all should have received that.

Karen Morse (Western Washington University): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council, I urge the members' support of Proposal No. 18 that the Presidents Council is sponsoring.

The Presidents Council supports this proposal because it enhances student-athlete welfare. It is aimed to promote competitive equity. The Presidents Council reminds the membership that this is permissive legislation, meaning that the decision to cover a board allowance for student-athletes at a higher cost than other students is left to the discretion of each institution. For those reasons, the Presidents Council urges you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-18) was adopted, 167-34-4.]

Housing and Meals—Vacation-Period Expenses

Willie G. Shaw (Morehouse College): On behalf of the Division II Legislative Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

It is a common occurrence for an institution's team to return to campus from season-ending competition during an institution's vacation period. Under current legislation, it is not permissive for the institution to provide any expenses to student-athletes once they arrive back on campus even if dormitories and dining facilities are

closed. Although the current legislation does allow it to provide travel expenses to student-athletes for a period of time up to 36 hours following the end of the competition, this does not include room and board expenses once student-athletes have returned to the institution's campus.

This proposal would provide institutions the discretion of providing room and board for a reasonable period of time in these instances. The Division II Legislative Committee urges your support for this proposal.

Karen Morse (Western Washington University): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 19 that the Presidents Council is sponsoring.

The Presidents Council supports this proposal that provides institutions discretion to provide room and board expenses to the student-athletes returning to campus during vacations following games or contests. The Presidents Council believes that Division II student-athlete welfare is enhanced with the adoption of this proposal. The Presidents Council encourages you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-19) was adopted, 194-2-1.]

Ms. Styles Johnson: I have an announcement for the delegates regarding Proposal 20. Yesterday, the Presidents Council was asked to consider adopting an amendment-to-amendment to include men's sports in the proposal that accelerates the timetable for the establishment of national championships for emerging women's sports.

The Presidents Council does have the authority at this meeting to sponsor amendments-to-amendments. Unfortunately, Constitution 5.3.1.4 limits amendment changes to modification that do not increase the original proposal. An amendment to include men would increase the proposal. I must note that the Presidents Council remains committed to Proposal No. 20.

The Executive Committee has asked all three divisions to adopt this legislation as a result of a gender audit that shows that the NCAA needs to sponsor additional championship opportunities for women. Recent litigation aimed at making the NCAA subject to Title IX compliance makes the legislation changes set forth in Proposal No. 20 even more crucial and important and a wise proactive decision by the membership division.

The Presidents Council pledges that it will sponsor legislation at next year's Convention to modify the sponsorship requirement for men's sports from two years to one year as well. The Presidents Council does not believe that this one-year delay will have any negative implications for men's championship since there are currently no emerging sports for men in any division. With that, I think we are ready to consider Proposal 20.

Women's Championships—Sponsorship Criteria— Minimum Period

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the NCAA Division II Championships Committee, I move Proposal 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

Current legislation specifies that a championship may be established in a women's sport if at least 40 institutions sponsor that sport, and that such legislation may be established after the sport has met the minimum requirement of two consecutive years.

Please note that the numbers listed in your Convention bulletin in the rationale section of Proposal 20 are incorrect. Currently, the number of institutions sponsoring emerging sports is as follows: women's water polo, 40; women's ice hockey, 52; women's squash, 27; women's bowling, 21.

If the waiting period were reduced from two years to one year, legislation can be moved at this Convention to establish both a women's ice hockey and a women's water polo championship in 2000 and 2001. This proposal would also assist member institutions in meeting their legal obligations under Title IX. On behalf of the Division II Championships Committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

Marvalene Hughes (California State University, Stanislaus): I stand before you to ask for support of Proposal 20 for the following reasons: Yesterday we heard that the Executive Committee fully supports diversity and equity. We also experienced the delegate votes as well.

The Presidents Council requests your support of this proposal for the following reasons: First of all, it addresses gender equity and thereby increases opportunities for women athletes to address the universality of the problem of equity.

Secondly, it is inherent in the core values of everything represented by Division II. We have witnessed it in our strategic-planning process, we have witnessed it in our diversity initiative. We have witnessed it in many other actions.

Our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee would like to indicate its support also for this initiative because it provides more opportunities for women student-athletes. As referenced earlier, it is one preventive measure for any liabilities regarding equity. This measure will ultimately "fast track" emerging sports for student-athletes who are women. And it is because of this, that the Presidents Council asks that you support Proposal 20.

Earl W. Edwards (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge you to support this proposal that is sponsored by the Presidents Council. This proposal would reduce the minimum number of years from two to one year needed to establish a women's championship once the minimum number of sponsoring institutions is met.

The NCAA Executive Committee has made a commitment to "fast track" certain emerging sports to national championships to assist institutions by providing more options for women sports to sponsor at the varsity level. The Management Council urges you to support Proposal No. 20.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-21) was adopted, 187-14-4.]

National Collegiate Championship—Women's Ice Hockey

Thomas Kearns (Northern Kentucky University): On behalf of the NCAA Division II Championships Committee, I move Proposal No. 21.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an effort to increase NCAA championship opportunities for women, selected NCAA sports such as ice hockey have been identified as sports in which to establish a National Collegiate Championship.

Currently, there are 52 member institutions in Divisions I, II and III that sponsor women's ice hockey. The establishment of a National Collegiate Championship for women's ice hockey necessitates the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administration responsibilities.

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Management Council and Championships Committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

Establishing a women's ice hockey championship and a committee to govern it recognizes the growing interest and support for the sport and assists in the efforts to increase championship opportunities for women.

For these reasons, the Championships Committee and the Management Council encourage you to favor this proposal.

[Proposal No. 21 (Page A-22) was adopted.]

National Collegiate Championship—Women's Water Polo

Earl W. Edwards (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the NCAA Division II Championships Committee, I move Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an effort to increase NCAA championship opportunities for women, selected NCAA sports such as water polo have been identified as sports in which to establish a National Collegiate Championship.

Currently, there are 40 member institutions that sponsor women's water polo. The establishment for women's water polo necessitates the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administrative responsibilities.

The Championship Committee urges your support of Proposal No. 22.

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Management Council and Championships Committee, I urge your support of this proposal.

The establishment of a women's water polo championship and a committee to govern it will not only create more NCAA championship opportunities for women, it will also meet the growing interest and support for this sport at institutions in all three divisions.

For these reasons, the Management Council and Championships Committee encourage you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Nancy P. Simpson (California State University, San Bernardino): I'd like to speak in support of this proposal.

We recently added women's water polo at our institution and could not be more pleased. We presently compete for the opportunity to attend a national championship sponsored by U.S. Water Polo, the national governing body for the sport. However, for the sport to go nationwide, sponsorship by the NCAA is critical. The sooner we gain the recognition associated with the NCAA sponsorship, the faster the sport will grow.

Given the addition of women's water polo as the newest Olympic sport in this summer's competition in Sydney, Australia, the establishment of the national championship by the NCAA will tremendously enhance the recognition factor. This will further enhance the sport's growth and offer more opportunities for our female student-athletes. I urge your support of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 22 (Page A-23) was adopted.]

Ms. Styles Johnston: For the next vote, I'd like to note for the delegates that this is a football-only vote. Only those schools that sponsor football can vote on this proposal.

Geographical Scheduling Waiver—Football

Kaye P. Crook (Coker College): On behalf of the Division II Membership Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

The geographical waiver of the 50-percent schedule requirement in the sport of football should be eliminated inasmuch as such a waiver in Division II should not be contingent upon the amount of athletically related financial aid that an institution awards in football or the number of institutions granting minimal aid that are located in close proximity to an institution.

This legislation was written specifically to assist Division I-AA institutions and does not have a practical application in Division II. An institution that does have a legitimate or geographical difficulty in scheduling opponents may still apply for a waiver per Bylaw 20.10.4.4.

The Division II Membership Committee urges your support of this proposal.

Charles D. Dunn (Henderson State University): As has already been pointed out, the current geographical waiver rule is tied to the amount of aid a school offers and was developed specifically for I-AA schools, but we have some other opportunities to provide for waivers when we have legitimate geographical scheduling problems. For that reason, the Presidents Council encourages you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 23 (Page A-24) was adopted, 115-3-2.]

Ms. Styles Johnston: Coming up next are the deregulation pro-

posals—24 through 34. I'd like to take these things as a group. I have an announcement to make starting with Deregulation Proposal No. 24. I want to note to all of you that Proposal No. 26-E will be moot if Proposal No. 24-B is adopted.

Use of Institutional Name or Logo

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the spirit of deregulation, the Division II Legislation Committee believes it is not necessary to legislate the prohibition of athletics department staff members from utilizing indirectly or by implication an institution's name or logo in endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer.

The committee believes that the institution and copyright laws governing the use of an institution's names and logos adequately control this issue.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal. Thank you.

David W. Coffey (Norwood University): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge your support for this proposal that the Division II Presidents Council has sponsored.

The Management Council and the Presidents Council realize the decisions regarding use of institutional logos is best left to the chief executive officer and administrators on each campus. Institutions can decide to continue current prohibitions or decide to adopt more liberal application of such restrictions. The bottom line is that this is an area that the NCAA should not control. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of this deregulation proposal.

[Proposal No. 24 (Page A-24) was adopted, 183-8-2.]

Personnel—Athletically Related Income

Paul H. Englemann (Central Missouri State University): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the spirit of deregulation, the Division II Legislation Committee believes that this legislation can be eliminated from Division II management.

In rare occurrences when this legislation does impact Division II institutions, issues related to athletically related income are more appropriately controlled at the institutional level.

Further, in Division II, outside income in significant amounts is not commonplace. Issues related to outside income should be left to the discretion of the institution and are not appropriately regulated by the NCAA.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal. Thank you.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I rise in support of this deregulation proposal sponsored by the Division II Presidents Council.

Like the proposal we just considered, this is an area that Division II institutions should regulate, not the NCAA. Contracts involving institutional personnel should not be subject to NCAA legislation.

Restrictions regarding outside income recently resulted in a multimillion judgment in Division I and the Management Council and the Presidents Council in Division II believe that this deregulation initiative is appropriate for our division. For these reasons, I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal.

Arend Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I think it's important to note that this legislation does not eliminate the stipulations from employment contracts; rather, the proposal is merely turning authority governing the stipulations of the contract from the NCAA to each institution.

Institutions may decide to continue to require such stipulations for its athletics staff or schools may decide to limit some of the restrictions.

The Division II Presidents Council agreed to sponsor this deregulation proposal because it believes that issues relating to athletically related income are handled best at the institutional level.

For these reasons, please vote in favor of Proposal No. 25.

[Proposal No. 25 (Page A-26) was adopted, 191-4-1.]

Outside-Income Restrictions

Leon Kerry (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of the Division II deregulation project. It was the sense of the Division II Legislation Committee that this legislation is not relevant to Division II and in most cases can be eliminated from the Division II Manual. In rare occurrences, these bylaws do impact Division II institutions; however, the issues are more appropriately controlled at the institutional level.

In Division II outside income, a large amount is not commonplace. Further, it should be legislated that institutions monitor receipt of outside income. The committee believes that this should also be at the discretion of the institution. The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support for this proposal.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): As a member of the Management Council, I urge support of Proposal 26, which is sponsored by the Presidents Council.

This is the third proposal we are considering today that deregulates Bylaw 11. As we've heard from the previous proposals, the Management Council and the Presidents Council believe that outside income restrictions in Division II are issues best handled at the insti-

tutional level.

The Presidents Council and the Management Council want the NCAA out of the business of regulating this area for Division II membership. Where regulations need to exist, they should exist and be enforced by the various institutions. For these reasons, I urge your support in favor of this proposal.

Albert J. Shannon (Saint Joseph's College, Indiana): As a member of the Presidents Council, I ask you to vote in favor of Proposal 26.

The restrictions Proposal 26 attempts to eliminate are not necessary in Division II. These are restrictions that were driven by a Division I philosophy. Division II decided in the old structure to also incorporate the regulations in our governing bylaws. Now with the federated structure, we have the autonomy to address Division II issues, and we have the tools to make legislative changes so that our governing bylaws match the philosophy of our division. This proposal is a step in the right direction. For those reasons, I urge your support of the proposal.

[Proposal No. 26 (Page A-27) was adopted, 203-3-1.]

Employment With Professional Sports Organizations— Nonpermissible Arrangements

Robert L. Heiny (University of Northern Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 27.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. The Legislation Committee feels that employment with professional sports organizations during times a staff member is not under contract with an institution should be permissible in Division II.

Division II coaching salaries are, in most cases, not comparable to those in Division I and very often necessitate coaches securing outside employment during the summer when they are normally not under contract to the institution. Many times such employment is available through professional sports organizations. An amendment to this legislation would be deregulation, not only because legislation would be deleted, but it would also no longer make it necessary for an institution to monitor such outside employment during times when staff members are not under contract to the institutions.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal.

Thomas R. Shirley Jr. (Philadelphia University): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge your support of Proposal 27, which is sponsored by the Division II Presidents Council.

The Division II Management Council and Presidents Council believe this is an area the division should not restrict for Division II coaches. By eliminating the current restrictions, Division II coaches would be permitted to be employed by pro teams or sport organiza-

tions during the times that the staff member is not under contract with the school. This seems like a reasonable approach by the membership. For this reason, the Management Council and Presidents Council urge your support.

Arend Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): As a member of the Presidents Council, I urge your support of Proposal No. 27. The Presidents Council supports this deregulation proposal because it eliminates a restriction that we do not need in Division II.

Many Division II coaches are not under contract with schools in the summer and need to find ways to supplement their incomes. The NCAA should not limit compensation opportunities for Division II coaches in this way. These are decisions that should be made at the institutional level. For these reasons, I encourage you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 27 (Page A-29) was adopted, 195-7-2.]

Permissible Employment or Income Arrangements— Professional Sports Organization

Janet Degginger (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move for the adoption of Proposal 28.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the spirit of the deregulation project, the Legislation Committee feels this is repetitive legislation and should be removed from the Manual.

The committee believes that the language of Bylaw 11.3.3.1 clearly states that restrictions relating to employment with professional sports organizations applies only to the athletics department staff members. Thus, it should not be necessary to reiterate that staff members and PE departments who have no relationship to or responsibilities in the athletics department are not prohibited from securing employment with a professional sports organization.

The Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 28 (Page A-30) was adopted, 191-1-2.]

Recruiting—Telephone Calls By Representatives of Athletics Interests

Dede M. Allen (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 29.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. Current legislation permits representatives of athletics interests to place phone calls to prospective student-athletes.

The Legislation Committee recommends that the legislation be amended to preclude phone calls to prospects by representatives of athletics interests. The committee feels this is an important element of Division II deregulation efforts inasmuch as it would eliminate the need for extensive monitoring of phone calls placed by boosters. This

will help alleviate concerns of improper contact and inaccurate information being provided to prospects by nonathletics staff members. The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal.

James W. Watson (West Liberty State College): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge you to support this proposal, which is sponsored by the Presidents Commission.

As someone who is closely associated with the day-to-day compliance activities, I understand the amount of monitoring that we ask our compliance officers to perform. It appears that this is an area where we can provide much-needed relief for our limited compliance staffs in Division II.

Charles Dunn (Henderson State University): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council, I urge you to support this proposal, which is sponsored by the Presidents Council.

As was pointed out a few moments ago, this is part of the deregulation effort. It will help to alleviate the concerns that we have over improper contacts being made by boosters and often misinformation being provided by those boosters to prospects. This seems like something we would want to do in Division II. I urge you to support it.

[Proposal No. 29 (Page A-31) was adopted, 188-14-0.]

Recruiting—Contact and Telephone Calls

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move Proposal No. 30.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of the Division II deregulation. The committee recommends that this legislation should be amended so that the first permissible date for contacts and telephone calls in all sports be June 15 immediately preceding the prospect's senior year in high school. Inasmuch as part of the deregulation charge is to simplify application of legislation and reduce the size of the Division II Manual, the committee feels a common date for contacting prospects should exist for all sports. This would simplify the application of recruiting legislation in Division II and would simplify the administrative responsibility for documenting and recruiting activities. The June 15 date will precede all current dates. This should alleviate the need for future proposals to continually amend the dates on a sport-by-sport basis. The Division II Legislation Committee asks for your support of the proposal.

Bruce Harger (Drury University): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge your support for this proposal, which is sponsored by the Presidents Council.

This proposal makes sense. To implement a common date of June 15 for the first recruiting contact and telephone calls not only simplifies the administrative responsibility for documenting recruiting activities, it also gives coaches and student-athletes one date to remember. I urge you on behalf of the Management Council to support Proposal No. 30.

Charles Dunn (Henderson State University): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council, we decided to sponsor this piece of legislation because we have a confusing array of permissible first contact dates. This proposal simplifies matters considerably and we urge your support.

[Proposal No. 30 (Page A-32) was adopted, 198-4-1.]

Recruiting—Evaluations

Michael J. Kovalchik (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 31.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. Division II legislation states that institutional staff members may evaluate the academic and/or athletics ability of a prospect at a site off the institution's campus a maximum of four times per academic year.

The committee recommends the elimination of this legislation. The committee feels that the restriction on the number of evaluations is not a practical concept in Division II. Once an institution observes a contest involving a given team four times during the academic year, the institution is precluded from observing any future contest involving that team during that year.

In reality, future evaluations involving this team may very well be the purpose of evaluating that team's performance. Current legislation prohibits this possibility, often placing undue financial and travel hardships on institutional staff members. This change would allow institutions the latitude to evaluate a team, for example, in junior colleges or high school located in close proximity to the institution more than four times—most likely for the purpose of evaluating prospects on the opposing team.

This would not cause undue pressure on prospective student-athletes inasmuch as contact restrictions would still apply. The definition of evaluation and the existence of an evaluation period would still exist.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal.

Gail Fults (Humboldt State University): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge you to support this proposal, which is sponsored by the Presidents Council. In Division II, it makes sense to provide some relief to our evaluation restrictions while leaving contact restrictions in place to avoid unreasonable pressure on local student-athletes. This proposal would also provide administrative relief to Division II compliance officers. The Management Council urges your support of Proposition 31.

Marvalene Hughes (California State University, Stanislaus): As a member of the Presidents Council, I rise to ask that you support this proposal, which is sponsored by the Council. The proposal is an example of deregulation that we support. The Council believes that

a restriction on the number of evaluations is very impractical. We also recognize that it poses undue financial hardship as well as travel hardship on staff members. This change is very consistent with our regional philosophy, and the Presidents Council urges your support of it.

David Riggins (Mars Hill College): I would like to rise in opposition to this deregulation proposal. As we look at the four-evaluation rule, all of us are reminded, there are not truly four evaluations per student-athlete, but four per year. If you back up to a student-athlete's sophomore year, you obviously get multiple evaluations, plus the fact that they are evaluated outside of the school year many times during summer sessions. I'm the athletics director at this point. I'm proud of this. I've been the head basketball coach and I have evaluated student-athletes as many as—even within NCAA rules as they exist right now—15 or more times, using some evaluations and multiple years in high school.

Also, I'd like for us to keep in mind that as we look at this deregulation proposal, this is a proposal that aids athletics programs or those programs that have bigger budgets and bigger staffs.

This concept of deregulation only aids in recruiting local athletes. All of us are aware that the coach is going to be out and recruiting at every evaluation opportunity. Who does it hurt? I think that as we allow more evaluations to go to the same student-athlete, obviously, evaluations start to be diminished for other student-athletes.

I think that also as a coach, I know it's been said it does not bring undue pressure on the student-athlete. The truth of the matter is, excessive evaluations give a coach the opportunity to the point of bringing pressure upon a student-athlete to ask the relevant question and who has shown the most interest in you. I ask that question many times only in circumstances where I knew I had been there more than anyone else. I would ask that we take all those things into consideration as we vote on that piece of legislation.

Roger Thomas (University of North Dakota): I would begin by saying I'm certainly in favor of the deregulation proposals, many of which we have passed to this point, and some of the others. But I would echo many of the sentiments the gentleman who preceded me in the fact that if you open the door in this particular area, I think there are some inherent disadvantages to certain people. Many of the points he made, I won't repeat all of those. But as an additional point, due to geography and the locations of some of our schools, it's a long way to go for an evaluation.

I would echo a couple of his statements in the fact that there is a little bit of one-upmanship—how many times did I come to evaluate you? I do disagree with one of the sentences that is in the booklet about the coach—there would be undue hardship and travel. I honestly believe it's the opposite. I think a coach would be pressured to try to do more evaluations and to keep up with anyone else who is doing multiple evaluations with the individual.

I don't think we want to pass any legislation that would have the possibility of some inherent inequities based on budget, location, size of staff and so forth. I believe he hit upon a lot of those points. So I would urge everyone to consider that and the time involvement of the coach and the travel that this could lend to everybody's budgets and so on. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 31 (Page A-34) was adopted, 136-70-2.]

Recruiting Materials

Sharon L. Taylor (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 32. [The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is also part of the Division II deregulation project. The committee recommends deletion of the list of permissible recruiting materials, while retaining the initial date for providing such materials.

The committee feels that Division II institutional athletics budgets provide an inherent control over the amount and types of printed materials our institutions will develop for the recruiting process.

Other than media guides, very often the athletics department utilizes printed materials developed by the admissions office. The committee does not feel this action would lead to abuse in so far as most institutional budgets will prohibit personnel from printing excessive printed materials. The Legislation Committee urges your adoption of this proposal.

Michael J. Marcil (Northern Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division II Management Council, I urge you to support this proposal, which is sponsored by the Presidents Council.

The current printed material restrictions in Division II are not necessary. The Management Council and Presidents Council believe that Division II institutional athletics budgets already limit the amount and types of printed material that an institution can develop for the purpose of recruiting. The Management Council and the Presidents Council urge you to support Proposal No. 32.

Albert J. Shannon (Saint Joseph's College, Indiana): As a member of the Presidents Council, I urge you to support this proposal, which is sponsored by the Presidents Council. We do not currently limit the amount of money that a school can spend on a weight room or on an athletics facility. We do not limit the amount of money that a school can spend on academic support service. So I find it hard to believe that we are concerned about how many colors can be on a recruiting brochure.

The Presidents Council believes that Division II institutions are in the best position to control the amount and types of recruiting material that they can develop. The Presidents Council urges your support for Proposal 32.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): I respectfully dis-

agree with the comment concerning institutional control on this. I firmly believe that what will happen if this is opened up is that there will be open warfare again on whatever recruiting material could be provided and will inherently drive up the cost immediately and then give the advantage to every institution that has the resources to do so. We were at that point many years ago. I believe it's important to have some measure of control in this area so it does not become the local warfare it used to be.

Kenneth Borden (University of Indianapolis): I'd like to speak in opposition to this. Even though we in Division II may be poor monetarily, we are very rich in competitive spirit. I have a fear that if we remove the restrictions, we may have one or two institutions that will select one of their men's or women's sports for Cinderella status and relegate the other three or four to ugly stepchildren.

[Proposal No. 32 (Page A-38) was adopted, 156-52-3.]

Recruiting—Complimentary Admissions (Official Visits)

Willie G. Shaw (Morehouse College): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 33.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal is part of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. The Legislation Committee recommends an amendment to the current legislation so that complimentary admission on official and unofficial visits are administered consistently.

The committee feels that it is not necessary to distinguish between official and unofficial visits related to the provision of the complimentary admission. The proposal would make it permissible to provide three complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event for prospects on both official and unofficial business.

These complimentary admissions would be for the exclusive use of a prospect and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit.

Current legislation will continue to control provisions of entertainment to high-school and two-year college coaches. The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support for this proposal. Thank you.

Gail Fults (Humboldt State University): On behalf of the Division II Management Council, I urge your support of this proposal, which the Presidents Council has agreed to sponsor. This legislation will simplify the management of complimentary admissions by eliminating the distinction between official and unofficial visits in the administration of complimentary admissions.

This seems like a way to handle campus visits in Division II. For these reasons, the Management Council urges you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 33 (Page A-40) was adopted, 200-1-0.]

Recruiting—Division II Tryout

Lisa C. Colvin (Southern Arkansas University): On behalf of

the Division II Legislation Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 34.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you can tell in your notice, this is the final portion of the Division II deregulation project.

Under the current Division II tryout legislation, only one tryout per prospect per institution is currently permitted. This proposal will permit the institution to provide one tryout per prospect per institution per sport.

This proposal is consistent with the deregulation project inasmuch as its modification would eliminate the bookkeeping necessary to tracking the tryout activities of multisport prospective student-athletes.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal.

Peggy L. Green (Fayetteville State University): On behalf of the Division II Management Council, I urge your support of this proposal, which the Presidents Council has agreed to sponsor.

In Division II, many institutions have multisport student-athletes. In the spirit of deregulation, this proposal eliminates the necessity of tracking the tryout activities for multisport prospective student-athletes. For this reason, the Management Council urges you to vote in favor of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 34 (Page A-41) was adopted, 202-2-2.]

Ms. Styles Johnston: The voting on Proposal 34 ends the presidential grouping. The remaining proposals that we deal with will be by paddle vote.

Now, for a little housekeeping, here's what we're going to do because we're moving along very rapidly. We're going to ask that the Championships Committee at this time give a brief report, and then given the time, we'll figure out how much more we'll do before lunch. If there is time left, we'll move into some other proposals. Otherwise, I would announce that we may break for lunch. So at this time, I will call the membership of the Championship Committee to give its report and the reconsiderations will come later.

CHAMPIONSHIPS COMMITTEE REPORT

Barbara J. Schroeder (Regis University, Colorado) Thank you, Dr. Johnston. I'll give a brief summary of some of the things that the Championships Committee is dealing with at this point and what it plans to continue to deal with over the next year or so. Then we'll try to open it up if we have a little time for some questions at the end.

Before I start, the Championships Committee lost a very important member in Dennis Poppe. He was a primary liaison to the Division II Championships Committee and as most of you know, Dennie has been assigned to some other duties. I can't tell you what they all are, but the next time you see him, make sure you have him fill you in. He's no longer our primary liaison. We now have Tom

Jacobs, who is here on my left, as our director of championships and the primary liaison for Division II. His assistant, Amy Frankenstein, also will join Division II as a secondary liaison.

So with that, please permit me to give this resolution in honor of Dennie Poppe. He can't be with us, but I know he'll be given this resolution with our appreciation and thanks:

Dennie Poppe, whereas, you have contributed to the Division II membership serving as the primary staff liaison to the Division II Championships Committee, and; whereas, you have demonstrated a deep commitment to Division II championships and; whereas, you have provided outstanding leadership and demonstrated strength of character, understanding, flexibility, and humor while working with the Division II membership. Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Division II membership wishes to express our deep appreciation to Dennis Poppe for his hard work, passion, and dedication to the growth of Division II.

We're deeply indebted to Dennie for all the years that he served Division II, and in his honor, I would appreciate a round of applause for Dennie. (Applause)

Let's turn our attention to Division II championships. At this time I'd like to recognize the members of the Division II Championships Committee. If they are with us, please stand and be recognized: Don Amiot, director of athletics, Minnesota State University, Mankato; Rita Castagna, athletics director at Assumption College; Pete Chapman, director of athletics, Missouri Western State College; Earl Edwards, director of athletics, East Stroudsburg University; Fred Jacoby, commissioner of the Lone Star Conference; Tom Kearns, faculty athletic representative, professor of mathematics and our resident statistician, Northern Kentucky University; Bill Lide, director of athletics, North Carolina Central University; David Riggins, director of athletics, Mars Hill College; Hindman Wall, University of Tampa; and our newest member, just ratified yesterday by the Presidents Council, Nancy Simpson, athletics director at Cal State San Bernardino.

I appreciate greatly the amount of work that these folks have done. It's been a challenging job as chair of this committee and a very rewarding experience, especially with the help of the committee. They've done amazing work, and we've got a lot ahead of us, so I appreciate it. I'll tell you how much I appreciate you now and then we'll get into the work that we have ahead of us.

The primary purpose of this session today is to cover one part of the Division II strategic plan as it relates to membership access to Division II national championships. As you know, our strategic plan that you received involves a long list of not only student-athlete welfare issues that involve championships, but championships issues that affect membership access.

Today, I'd like to give you a brief overview because that's the hottest topic right now. We've got all this new money. How are we

going to expand brackets? Are we going to get all the qualifiers in every sport? I just want to let you know where we are and give a laundry list of what we have to deal with right now.

The Division II Championships Committee has voted to retain automatic qualification as recommended by the Division II men's and women's basketball committees due to its importance in the redistribution formula for the Division II enhancement fund. We will continue to have automatic qualification in the two sports of men's and women's basketball because that's the driving force behind the enhancement-fund distribution.

Number two, the Division II Championships Committee has a policy of keeping conference members intact within regions, which ensures that no conference will have the opportunity to advance more than one member to a final site. As some of you know if you have served on some of the sports committees, we've been very devoted to try to keep all conference members operating and competing within the same region so that we don't have more than one conference school advancing in a sport championship.

The Division II Championships Committee has a policy for team championships that states that there must be an equal number of teams selected from each region. That gets back to our old concept of regionalization. Again, we've upheld that there is a policy in place that will continue to make that happen.

The Division II Championships Committee is considering the implementation of a similar policy that will require an equal number of individuals from each region for individual team championships effective in the 2000-01 academic year. That's a policy that we're considering. We will probably take a look at it tomorrow and Wednesday in our upcoming meeting. The Division II Championships Committee has agreed to explore the possibility of adding automatic qualification in other sports, but not before reviewing the issues of regional alignment and allocation of berths.

We have heard loud and clear from several of our constituents—the commissioners association as well as some of the team sports that do not currently have automatic qualifiers—that they'd like for us to take a look at the implication of having automatic qualification in other sports. So that's definitely on our agenda.

The Division II Championships Committee has agreed to explore alternative ways to examine the appropriateness of bracket and field sizes. For example, would sponsoring a percentage for team sports still be a valid guide with the influx of new members in Division II? When we look at percentages being the determining factor of how many participants we have in our championships, is that the best way to do it? The only way to increase these percentages with new membership would be if our existing members that sponsor sports add a sport.

So we're taking a look at the percentages being the determining factor versus possibly a ratio system being the determining factor.

This is a huge task. We have to take a look at all the numbers of sponsorships and what the new membership, the provisional members, are bringing to the table in the way of sports sponsorships.

At our meeting that will begin following this Convention, the Division II Championships Committee will be considering recommendations to expand the following team championships. As you might know, the Championships Committee asked every sports committee to come forward with proposals based on their regional alignments and their potential bracket sizes so we could act on recommendations as a Championships Committee that come from the sport committees.

The following sport committees have given us recommendations. We'll be acting on these this week: Field hockey, they are recommending going from two to 14. Men's lacrosse, from two to 14. Women's volleyball, from 32 to 48 teams. We're also going to be looking at expanding the field sizes for the following individual team championships: men and women's cross country, we'll be looking at expanding from six to eight regions with higher numbers of guaranteed berths per region. Men's and women's indoor track and field, at least 16 participants in each event. That would be what we would expand to, which would create a preliminary round. Men's and women's outdoor track and field would again be 16 participants per event, which would create preliminary rounds in outdoor track and field. Wrestling would be expanding to have 16 participants in each weight class with a total cap of 160 participants.

At our January meeting as well as our July meeting, we will be taking a look at how we want to proceed with recommendations to the Management Council and the Presidents Council with budgetary items. We feel this first round of requests will satisfy the numbers for bracket expansions in track and field and cross country, and possibly wrestling. We want to continue to take a look at other team sports that come before us and look at the recommendations that those sport committees would have to expand brackets. But as you know, this is going to entail a big-ticket item as far as the financial implications are concerned. We don't want to swamp the Presidents Council with all these requests right now. We have a plan in place that would sort of ease this stuff in. So that's kind of where we are. I guess we could open it up to questions, if you have any.

Are there are any burning questions? I'd be happy to meet with some of you at lunch. Tom and Amy will also be there. I would welcome any phone calls, questions that you might have.

One last thing—this is sort of the unpaid political announcement. We struggle always in trying to find any nominees for sports committees and rules committees. Our Nominating Committee in Division II does a great job of helping us recruit qualified folks for our committees, but I would encourage each of you to go back to your coaches, go back to your SWAs and encourage them to either self-nominate or you nominate them for a lot of the committee positions

that are open. Those vacancies are listed in The NCAA News each issue. Thank you for your time.

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Styles Johnston: Thank you.

We're going to break early for lunch. We will resume promptly at 1 o'clock instead of 1:30 so that we can try to get through everything in a very timely manner. Thank you very much.

[The delegates recessed for lunch.]

Monday Afternoon

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Ms. Styles Johnston: The meeting is now called to order. Please take your seats as soon as possible.

At this time, I would like to open the window of reconsideration for those proposals in the Presidents Council grouping—Proposal Numbers 13 through 34. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of any legislation within the Presidents Council grouping considered earlier today may move for reconsideration at this time.

I see no one standing, so the window of reconsideration is closed. I'd like to return to the proposals that we have remaining for the afternoon commencing with Proposal No. 35.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Recruiting—Telephone Calls

Robert L. Heiny (University of Northern Colorado): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 35.

[The motion was seconded.]

Many respective student-athletes, both recruited and nonrecruited, have committed to an institution and intend to "walk-on" to an athletics team, but have not signed a National Letter of Intent. Under current recruiting rules, institutions are still subject to limits on the number of telephone calls that can be made to such prospects. This proposal would permit an institution to call committed prospects who have signed the institution's written offer of admission or financial aid on the same basis as they call those prospects who signed the National Letter of Intent.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this legislation.

Tab Musser (Clarion University of Pennsylvania): I represent the views of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We respectfully disagree with the prior statement.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes Proposal No. 35. Just because a prospective student-athlete signed for admission or financial aid, this action does not guarantee his or her attendance

at that institution. We believe if restrictions on calls were eliminated from prospective student-athletes who have financial aid admission agreements, it would result in an increase of calls to prospective student-athletes.

The number of calls the student-athlete will receive comes at a busy time of year. We feel Proposal No. 35 adds extra stress during an important decision-making time in a prospective student-athlete's life. We encourage you to oppose Proposal No. 35. Thank you.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): Very eloquently spoken by the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. While I respect the committee's efforts in addressing the nonrecruited student-athletes, I think it's important to understand that presently students may only sign one letter of intent that results in unlimited phone calls from one institution.

However, students can and typically do sign or accept more than one offer of admission only to make sure they have the same option when it comes time to attend school. This can result in a prospective student receiving unlimited phone calls from an unlimited number of schools and coaches.

More importantly, most prospects will not realize what the results of their action is when they sign that acceptance. To acknowledge a letter of acceptance will have a profound negative effect in the limits of phone calls. More importantly is the fact that at the present time you can only sign one letter of intent that results in unlimited calls for one school. There is no legislation limiting the number of offers of admission one can accept. What happens when the prospect finally does sign the letter of intent? While it is my understanding that once you sign the letter of intent, all the other calls are off, I'm not sure how clear this is. To me, this seems to be an increase in cost and can cause some confusion. I would ask the Legislation Committee to review the legislation and address the issues concerning walk-ons. In the meantime, I urge your defeat of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 35 (Page A-42) was defeated.]

Offers and Inducements—Employment of Two-Year Prospects

Janet Degginger (Washburn University of Topeka): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal 36.

[The motion was seconded.]

Under current legislation, an institution is permitted to arrange employment for a prospect who begins after the completion of the prospect's senior year in high school. Thus, institutions currently are permitted to arrange employment opportunities for prospects who attend two-year colleges, including nonqualifiers or partial qualifiers who fail to satisfy the initial-eligibility requirements upon graduation from high school. The arrangement of employment opportunities for prospects currently enrolled at two-year colleges should be considered an improper offer and inducement, inasmuch as it creates unnecessary pressure for institutions to arrange for employment

opportunities.

Consistent with the current regulation that relates to high-school prospects, once a prospect enrolls as a full-time student at a two-year college, the arrangement for employment should be permissible only if the employment does not begin until such time as the prospect has withdrawn from or has completed requirements for graduation at the two-year college.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 36 (Page A-42) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Recruiting—Video Materials

Dede M. Allen (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 37.

[The motion was seconded.]

Most institutions have Web sites today that are available to families who can afford computers. This proposal would allow the same type of information contained on those Web sites, for example, information on educational offerings, the local community, to be shared with prospects who cannot afford a computer or Internet access. The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support on this proposal.

[Proposal No. 37 (Page A-43) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Advertisements and Promotions—Championships Posters

Lisa C. Colvin (Southern Arkansas University): On behalf of the Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 38.

[The motion was seconded.]

As you are aware, under current legislation, it is permissible for an institution hosting an NCAA or conference championship to produce a poster to promote the championship, providing that you do not send it directly to prospects, their coaches and/or their educational institution.

Institutions hosting an NCAA or conference championship may provide information related to the event through general correspondence. Permitting an institution that is hosting an NCAA or conference championship to produce a poster promoting the championships and send it to high-school coaches and/or their educational institutions will allow for a more effective promotion of the event.

However, in order to minimize the use of these posters as a recruiting tool, it remains impermissible for an institution to send such posters directly to prospective student-athletes. The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 38 (Page A-44) was adopted.]

Official Visit—Complimentary Admissions

Michael J. Kovalchik (Hillsdale College): On behalf of the

Division II Legislation Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 39.

[The motion was seconded.]

Complimentary admissions to home competitions outside the community currently are available to prospects and parents, or legal guardians or spouse, on unofficial visits. However, on official visits, complimentary admissions are only available to campus athletics events. Under current legislation, a prospect can purchase a ticket to an off-campus home contest using the entertainment allowance, provided the site of the competition is within the permissible 30-mile radius.

This proposal would permit a prospect and his or her parents, legal guardians or spouse to attend the local off-campus regular-season home competition without having to use his or her entertainment allowance.

The Division II Legislation Committee urges your support on this proposal.

[Proposal No. 39 (Page A-45) was adopted.]

Nonscholastic-Based Basketball

Sallie Beard (Missouri Southern State College): On behalf of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I move Proposal 40.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a common-sense approach to permit basketball coaches to participate in coaching activities involving nonscholastic-based teams, provided the participants have not entered the ninth grade.

A situation occurred in our conference last year when a volunteer coach was prohibited from coaching her daughter on a grade-school team. Coaches in other sports are allowed to be involved with youth teams up to the high-school level and the same should be permitted for basketball. Thank you.

Fred H. Jacoby (Lone Star Conference): We rise to support this legislation. We think it's common-sense legislation. If we have summer basketball camps for the ninth through the 12th grade, certainly we ought to allow coaches to coach their son or daughter in the fifth grade optimist basketball league. So we support this as common-sense legislation.

Tim W. Selgo (Grand Valley State University): I'd like to speak in opposition to this proposal. While the previous comments are well-understood, I would like to point out that many nonscholastic basketball teams (i.e., AAU basketball teams), while trying to permit our coaches to coach at the eighth-grade level, belong to AAU organizations. They have a 13-and-under team, a 14-and-under team, a 16-and-under team and so on. It will put our coaches in proximity with organizations that have individuals of a prospect's age.

I'd also like to point out that I think we are all well aware of some of the concerns that have been expressed in college basketball and recruiting as it relates to nonscholastic basketball. I know our

Division I folks, I believe, have a committee that has looked very hard at this issue, and there are some very real concerns associated with it. I know Division III doesn't permit it. I know we are our own division, but I would encourage Division II to vote this down.

[Proposal No. 40 (Page A-45) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Season of Competition Waiver—60-Day Deadline

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): On behalf of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 41.

[The motion was seconded.]

This is a proposal that is designed to eliminate a provision of the legislation that requires season of competition waivers to be submitted within 60 days of the date that the institution first becomes aware that the student-athlete competed while ineligible.

The 60-day requirement seems to serve no legitimate purpose and it can unfairly penalize a student-athlete if the institution carelessly or inadvertently fails to meet the deadline.

This proposal will eliminate the 60-day requirement. We urge adoption of this proposal and recommend an immediate effective date.

[Proposal No. 41 (Page A-46) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Contest Exemption—Division II Football—Mineral Water Bowl

Ms. Styles Johnson: Proposal No. 42 is a football-only vote. Only those schools that sponsor football can vote on this proposal.

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): I move Proposal No. 42.

[The motion was seconded.]

This legislation is modeled after the Pioneer Bowl, which matches teams from the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. This game has been in existence since 1997.

In this proposal, the top-ranked teams not selected for the NCAA Division II Football Championship from the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference will play in a postseason game held in Excelsior Springs, Missouri.

Proceeds from the game are donated to charitable and educational organizations in the local community. This game will increase the exposure and the visibility for Division II football on a regional and national basis. This is permissive legislation. The MIAA and NSIC encourages other conferences to do the same to promote Division II football.

James H. Jordon (Delta State University): I think it's a great idea, but we make an exception for two conferences. I think we need to do it for everybody to have a chance to go to a bowl game. So I'm

opposed. I think it's a good idea, we're not opposed to the idea, but we'd like to go a bowl, too, if we don't make the NCAA playoff.

This isn't a deregulation rule. Now we are making an exception for two conferences. I feel like we ought to look at it and make it good for everybody or not at all.

Richard Cosby (Clark Atlanta University): We support this particular legislation. We think it expands opportunities for Division II postseason play for student-athletes. We'd like to go on record as endorsing this proposal because we think it would add to our conference.

Leon Kerry (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): The exception has already been made—the Pioneer Bowl was approved. It's good for Division II. It's good for the Mineral Water Bowl. It gains extra exposure for the young men who play football and additional revenue for the conferences and for the schools that support it.

Thomas R. Wistrcill (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): I have a question and maybe a point of clarification. Is it true with the Pioneer Bowl that a team chose not to participate in the Division II football playoffs and chose to participate in the bowl game instead? If someone either at the podium or within those conferences can answer that question, please.

Mr. Kerry: Not true. The first option is for the playoffs. The second-place team that does not go to the playoff participates in the Pioneer Bowl.

Mr. Wistrcill: Thank you.

I ask that question simply because in our discussion with our conference, we didn't have a problem with the NSIC and the MIAA having a bowl game. Our concern was that we were excited they did it down South. We're excited they are doing it there. Our concern was about where do we draw the line as far as if we get eight, 10, 12, 14 of these bowl games. It might be great for Division II football, but at some point, does it take away from our Division II championship and the television revenue? We're thinking that maybe at some point we're going to gain some major exposure out of this.

Our concern out of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference was where do we draw the line? I'm not sure that two bowl games would draw it. I'm not sure 10 is the number, but that is our concern.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): I think that the group should note this increased interest in more postseason opportunities in football. At the Division II commissioners' meeting in November, this was an issue that came to the floor and there was a unanimous feeling among the football-playing member conferences that there is a need for the Championships Committee to look at the size of the field in Division II football.

In terms of student-athlete numbers, the numbers playing football are very, very high. In terms of opportunities, they are very, very minimal. There is a tremendous imbalance in the number of teams in one of the regions as compared to some of the others.

I think that it's great that people want the bowl games. It's wonderful that they will work within regions and between conferences that have the right kind of relationship. But again, I think it speaks to a greater issue. Even though it's an imbalance and even though it's not popular yet to reexamine the need for expansion in some of the men's sports, football is crying out at least in the south and asking for help in an expansion of the NCAA Division II Football Championship for postseason play.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): I'd like to speak in favor of Proposal 42.

As Commissioner Salant has indicated, there is a need for expansion of the bracket size in Division II football. Many good teams are simply not able to continue playing because of bracket size. The bowl opportunity does offer that chance for good teams to continue participation.

I also thought that Jim Jordan made a very good point regarding just doing these piecemeal. Perhaps we ought to look at what the long-term aspects of this might be, except that I don't think we ought to take that out of this particular proposal.

I would hope that this body would support Proposal 42 in creation of this bowl. Let's think in terms of both expansion for opportunities in championships for football in Division II as well as other bowl opportunities for those teams that are not participating in NCAA championships. I urge your support for 42.

Ed Harris (West Texas A&M University): I'm very much in support of what Doug is saying.

I think we should support this, but I would like to see us think in terms of not having to write a new paragraph in the booklet each time. Let's come up with a way to set this up for schools to do it so that we can get the bowl games approved without expanding the size of the Manual.

Wallace Jackson (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): We have followed all provisions. I don't think two conferences should be penalized for following the process. I urge you all to support the proposal.

[Proposal No. 42 (Page A-47) was adopted.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Division II Women's Lacrosse

Stephen L. Murray (Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference): I move the adoption of Proposal 43.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 42 can be categorized as a permissive piece of legislation that would provide participation opportunities during the nonchampionship segment in the sport of women's lacrosse.

This establishes the same level of participation opportunities that currently exist for similar sports in Division II and should be extended to the fast-growing sport that will begin Division II championship play in 2001. The Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference strongly urges your support of Proposal No. 43.

Marjorie Trout (Millersville University of Pennsylvania): I'm

here to represent the Management Council and the Presidents Council. We urge you to support this proposal. I think Commissioner Murray has explained the reason for it. We certainly do support the same participation in the nonchampionship segment for all sports.

[Proposal No. 43 (Page A-48) was adopted.]

Preseason Practice Start Date—Division II Tennis

Dave Brunk (Northeast-10 Conference): I would like to move Proposal 44.

[The motion was seconded.]

This particular piece of legislation will permit an institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship in tennis during the fall the opportunity to commence practice August 24 or the first day of classes, whichever is earlier.

Since 1997, when legislation was adopted to set September 7 for the first day of class as the date when preseason practice in tennis can commence, waiver requests have been submitted by conference offices or institutions that granted enabling an earlier start.

Passage of this legislation would eliminate the repetitive burden placed on the membership and NCAA staff and allow those affected schools the flexibility of an earlier start date.

For these reasons, the Northeast-10 Conference urges the adoption of Proposal 44.

[Proposal No. 44 (Page A-49) was adopted.]

First Date of Competition—Division II Tennis

Thomas J. Brown (Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 45.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal 45 really is a piggyback on No. 44. The rationale is pretty straightforward. It's really to have a level playing field for those schools that have tennis in a conference in their traditional season in the nontraditional season. It would allow them all to start at the same time with playing. We urge support of this.

[Proposal No. 45 (Page A-50) was adopted.]

Division II Membership—Transfer of Provisional Membership

Kaye P. Crook (Coker College): On behalf of the Division II Membership Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 46.

[The motion was seconded.]

During the first two years of provisional membership, institutions are educated regarding the requirements for active membership in the division that the institution has selected. During the educational segment of provisional membership, some institutions that initially sought Division I or III membership may discover that they are better suited for Division II membership. When such circumstances occur, the provisional member transferring from I or III into Division II should be given the opportunity to do so without requiring them to begin the four-year process over again.

The Division II Membership Committee urges your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 46 (Page A-50) was adopted.]

Change of Division Membership— Notification and Championships Eligibility

Mary Gardner (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Division II Membership Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 47.

[The motion was seconded.]

Currently, a Division II institution that wishes to reclassify to Division III must only inform the national office June 1 prior to the September 1 in which it wishes to become a Division III member.

Further, such an institution remains eligible for Division II championships during the reclassification compliance period. However, in order to meet the reclassification requirements, the Division II institution must have complied with Division III legislation for three years prior to reclassification.

In this regard, since these institutions are applying Division III legislation and focused on transitioning to Division III, the institution should not be eligible for selection for Division II championships during this time period, and staff members from the institution should be excluded from service on Division II committees.

The Division II Membership Committee urges your support of this proposal.

Allen Lee Sessoms (Queens College, New York): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council, I urge your support for Proposal 47.

The Division II Management Council and Presidents Council believe that this legislation is necessary to address concerns regarding membership reclassification. This proposal establishes a notification period for schools that intend to reclassify from Division II to Division III. Such a notification requirement already exists when a school moves from Division II to Division I.

In addition, the Management Council and Presidents Council are committed to ensuring that schools represented on Division II committees and schools competing in Division II championships are committed to the Division II philosophy. This legislation will prevent schools that have decided to reclassify to Division III from continuing to participate in Division II events and being involved in Division II committee issues. For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 47.

Kelly Higgins (University of South Dakota): I rise in support of 47-A and -C. I have a question as to 47-B. In all honesty, why are we concerned about whether or not they are participating in the Division II championships when they have made the commitment to reduce the resources they give to athletic programs? My question would be, how long then must they wait once they are in Division III to partic-

ipate in championships as well? Why would you want to hurt the opportunity of the student-athletes to participate if it's possible? I'd certainly like to pull that off for separate consideration.

James R. Johnson (NCAA Staff): They would be immediately eligible once they became classified in Division III. It would be a three-year period that they would be ineligible for any championship.

Ms. Higgins: Thank you, Jim. My question still stands. What's there to fear in allowing institutions to participate? Proposal 47-A and -C makes sense philosophically in the future of the programs of Division II, but why deny them that opportunity when they have clearly made a decision to reduce the resources in their program to make that maneuver? Of course, that's with the expectation we all understand that Division III does have fewer resources. That doesn't mean I agree with that, of course.

Ms. Styles Johnston: Kelly, before you leave, I feel compelled to tell you that you can separate these if you wish to present something to do so.

Mr. Higgins: I move to separate 47-B for separate consideration. [The motion was seconded and failed.] [Proposal No. 47 (Page A-51) was adopted.]

Change of Division Membership—Committee Service

Penny Clayton (Drury University): On behalf of the Division II Membership Committee, I move adoption of Proposal 48. [The motion was seconded.]

The NCAA Division II Membership Committee believes that when a Division II institution forwards its intent to reclassify to Division I, individuals from the institution should no longer serve on Division II committees.

These personnel are at that time focused on Division I issues and completing the transition to Division I. This doesn't make it possible for such individuals to contribute effectively to conducting a committee's business. The committee believes that in the best interest of the division, committee service should be restricted to personnel from Division II institutions and should not be extended to personnel from reclassifying institutions.

The Division II Membership Committee urges your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 48 (Page A-53) was adopted.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Styles Johnston: There is some housekeeping things. It's very important that we talk to you before you leave. Mike Racy has a couple of announcements to give you.

Mike Racy (NCAA Staff): We got done so quickly with the legislation that we didn't have time to make copies of all of the roll-call votes, the institutional list. I think there are copies through Proposal 26 out at the interpretations center as you leave. If you would like to

see the institutional list for other proposals, we have those in the governance staff work room, which is just across the hall as you exit. Stop by there if you want to check that. I'm going to turn it back over to Chancellor Johnston.

Ms. Styles Johnston: Thanks very much, Mike. It's very rare when we finish in such a timely fashion. Do you have any matters of concern that you'd like to raise? The only thing that's standing between you and the sunshine outside is how many questions we get or comments. But feel free to go to the microphone if you are so moved.

Jo Spearman (Mississippi University for Women): I'm sorry to be standing between you and the sunshine.

I do have grave concerns about the athletic training issue that was raised in the Division II meeting yesterday. I thought the president from Fort Hays made some very, very good points. If you're not paying attention to the athletic training issue, you need to be. I have concerns about the percentages that were produced yesterday.

I would like to know what the actual numbers were. How many of those schools that the questionnaire was sent to are actually Division II institutions? I think percentages can be used in different ways. The actual number becomes very, very important.

I am very interested in how institutions are going to solve this problem and would love to hear from you. I agree with the Fort Hays president that I think money is the motivating principle here. I was concerned that the NATA representative made the statement that in the 1980s, their test was not being passed by Division II institutions that have an internship program. Rather than take that as a negative, I will take it as a positive that the test was doing its job of keeping those who were not qualified from being athletic trainers. To me, it puts the onus on the institution to do a good job of preparing your students.

I think we all know that if students do not pass certification tests, the word is going to be out on you very quickly that you are not doing a good job and that students are not getting the opportunity to go on and become athletic trainers. I am very interested in seeing that the internship program remain.

James W. Watson (West Liberty State College): Thank you for expressing concern. Those of you who were at the forum yesterday are now aware of a problem that you may not have been prior to this Convention. This really just came into focus last April when the Management Council met in Newport Beach. What we tried to do yesterday was to raise the level of awareness without getting into a full assault of the NATA. That may come later. I was very curious to note as we discussed this in the Management Council that we've only seen very few statistics from the NATA at the Management Council level. The competitive safeguards committee may have seen more data, but if you were here yesterday you heard me challenge the representative to go back and to work at least in reopening a discussion, which up until

yesterday had pretty much been shut down. There was a total lack of willingness, at least, at certain levels to discuss this issue.

I also found it very interesting from the statistic that only 20 percent of NATA certified trainers are employed at the collegiate level. We would estimate that maybe 5 to 10 percent are in professional ranks and this leads the vast majority. The rest of the certified trainers are in the high school ranks. I think that there is clearly a desire for upward mobility. In this great land of America, there is nothing wrong with that. However, the problem is, I believe that the NATA feels that they have a supply of trainers that is more than adequate and they would like to see those trainers employed at NCAA institutions before we turn out another bumper crop. The internship program has certainly led to a greater number of trainers.

So we're hoping that the competitive safeguards committee will continue to press this issue and look for ways to revisit some of these decisions that were made apparently with minimal input on the part of the Association

Ms. Styles Johnston: Thank you, very much. I forgot one little thing that I have to do. I'm obliged to say that if you wish to reconsider any of the proposals between 35 and 48, this would be the appropriate time to do so. Seeing that there are none, we consider that you liked them all.

I'd like to say a few brief remarks. When we came to the Convention, we recognized that we had 47 proposals. There was a great deal of anxiety as if we could even come close to finishing the meeting by 5 o'clock and what we would do if we had to go into overtime with this. I want to thank all of you for diligently paying attention and moving through a very laborious process that you helped to make very painless. We think that this will benefit our Association tremendously.

I hope that there is no feeling from anyone that because we moved so expeditiously that there has been any stifle of dialogue. Part of the philosophy that we have in our division is certainly one of openness and inclusiveness and respect for individual thoughts, even when they may disagree with our own position. The future vitality of our Association is very important for us to preserve the kind of camaraderie and professionalism and civility that exists in Division II.

Having said that, I am very pleased for the progress that we have made at the meeting today, and I look forward to seeing you at next year's Convention in Orlando.

[The Division II business session was adjourned.]

□ Division III Forum

Sunday Afternoon, January 9, 2000

The Division III forum was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Presidents Council Chair Ann Die, Hendrix College, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Die: Good afternoon, and welcome to this afternoon's Division III issues forum. I am Ann Die, president of Hendrix College and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. Joining me at the dais are Megan Stevens, a student-athlete from State University of New York at Cortland and a member of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee; Carol Wittmeyer, vice-president for university relations at Alfred University; Rob Morrissey, a member of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee from Vassar College; and Michael Josephson, the founder of the Josephson Institute of Ethics. You will hear more about and from each of these individuals in a few minutes.

This is the third year we have conducted a Division III issues forum on Sunday afternoon at the Convention. Each year, we have focused on issues that are of particular importance to our student-athletes, and we have involved our student-athletes directly in our presentations. This is consistent with our division's strategic plan, which places special emphasis on issues of student-athlete welfare and membership education. Of course, this is also consistent with our division's philosophy segment, which places the highest priority on the overall quality of the student-athletes' educational experience.

This year's format is no exception, as we will focus on the development of positive student-athlete behavior. With the help of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, we have identified subtopics and speakers who I know will capture your interest over the next two hours. My thanks to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee for its help in this regard; and I ask them to stand at this moment, please. (Applause) We thank them for the work they have put into this afternoon's session.

You probably noticed one difference from our past forums. We have seated you at round tables this year in order to foster greater dialogue and interaction. We have also attempted to seat a student-athlete at or near each table to ensure our discussions are as relevant and beneficial as possible. I'll ask our student-athletes to stand, even those who are not members of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. (Applause) I can assure you they appear although they did not all jump to their feet at once.

I am about to introduce Megan Stevens. Megan plays lacrosse and is on track to graduate in 2001. She not only serves on our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, but also is a new student-athlete representative on the NCAA's Committee on Women's Athletics. I

will also note that Megan spent the fall semester in London, so we are happy to have her back with us in the States and here today. Megan. (Applause)

DEVELOPING POSITIVE STUDENT-ATHLETE BEHAVIOR FORUM

Megan Stevens (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Thank you, President Die, and good afternoon. On behalf of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, welcome to the Division III forum on developing positive student-athlete behavior. First, I would like to call your attention to the resource table outside this room. There are materials on the table related to host conduct and character education. Please take only one packet per institution. We would like to thank all those institutions and conference offices that provided these materials. If you need more materials, please feel free to contact the national office staff members.

The goal of this forum is to learn and lead dialogue and to discuss issues related to develop positive student-athlete behavior and to ultimately provide you with information and resources on the development of codes of conduct and campus policies. As President Die mentioned, the top priority in Division III is student-athlete welfare. One of the tenets of the Division III philosophy is to encourage the development of sportsmanship and positive societal attitudes in all decisions, including student-athletes, coaches, administrative personnel, and spectators.

In that regard, it is imperative that you involve student-athletes to the greatest degree possible while planning and developing your campus and conference codes of conduct. Student-athletes are part of the problem; therefore, it is both logical and essential that you make us part of the solution. Members of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee are in attendance at this forum and will be located from table to table. I strongly encourage you to dialogue with them and have them share their views with you on this issue. We believe student-athletes can be instrumental in assisting in the development and implementation of codes of conduct.

Many of you will recall last year's discussion regarding alcohol use and abuse on athletics teams. It was led by Alfred President Dr. Ed Coll. The study was followed by the release of Alfred's landmark study on student initiation rites. Many of you provided information that was reflected in this study. Unfortunately, due to illness, President Coll will not be here with us today. Substituting for President Coll is Dr. Carol Wittmeyer.

Dr. Wittmeyer is the associate vice-president for university relations at Alfred University. As associate vice-president, Dr. Wittmeyer is responsible for prospect management and special solicitation programs. She will assist in the overall management of the division of university relations. Dr. Wittmeyer is very familiar with Alfred's study and will be discussing the results of the study and its impact on campuses across the nation. (Applause)

Carol Wittmeyer (Alfred University): Thank you, Megan. I am delighted to be here today on behalf of Alfred University President Ed Coll. As most of you know, he is ill with bronchitis. I was not the second choice. That was the principle author of the research, Dr. Nadine Hoover, who's also ill. So here I am.

As many of you know, Alfred University recently completed a study entitled "Initiation Rites in Athletics: A National Survey of NCAA Sports Teams" in an effort to quantify what we at Alfred University suspect might be a problem everywhere. This study is the result stemming from an incident we had on campus about a year-and-a-half ago involving one of our athletics teams and the hazing of their rookies. President Coll was appalled that such a thing could occur on our campus, where for more than 20 years he lived with the memory of another student tragedy, a young man who lost his life in a fraternity hazing.

The study that we completed could not be completed without the assistance of the NCAA; 224 institutions participated; 1,049 coaches; 348 athletic directors; 235 student-development vice-presidents; 2,027 student-athletes. Thank you for your help. We learned a lot.

Alfred's study, including its 3,500 participants, found that hazing cuts across all NCAA divisions, all types and sizes of campuses, all regions, and all sports. The study results were astounding and horrifying to all of us on campus. We learned that 80 percent of college athletes are victims of hazing. When this is projected to a national scale, that translates to over 250,000 students in this country who have been hazed.

This isn't a research methodology session here today, but we wish to show you that our study is based on a random sampling with a highly successful response rate for each of the categories I described earlier. We feel comfortable making this generalization. If you don't feel comfortable generalizing, then please keep in mind that numbers of students who took the survey told us that they were hazed in illegal and unacceptable ways, so we feel that this is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Hazing ranges from wearing silly clothes and extra exercises to kidnapping, beating, drinking until the student passes out, following the team-building tradition, or pranks. In the past, we may have seen it, but we dismissed it as essentially harmless fun. But we need to face hazing directly and call it what it is: Degrading or humiliating behavior that often crosses the line to dangerous and illegal activities.

You might be thinking, "So what, Carol, they wear funny clothes?" But we've learned that participation in particular types of behaviors significantly predicts more serious hazing is probably present. Let me explain, starting with the four types of usually exclusive initiations we learned after this study. By describing what it was they were doing on campus, we were able to categorize these behaviors into four categories: acceptable initiation behaviors, number one:

second, questionable initiation behaviors; third, alcohol-related; and fourth, unacceptable. I'd like to talk about each of these for a minute.

Acceptable initiation activities, the response rate on that was about 20 percent of students. By the way, females were more likely to be in this population than males. That translates to about 60,000 students nationally. I'll give you a list from the numbers responding: attending preseason training; another example, tests of skill, endurance, or performance; keeping a specific GPA is another one; dressing up for a team function, having to wear suits to events; attending a skit night or a team roast; doing voluntary community service; taking an oath or contract about behavior; and completing a ropes course. Now, those are initiation development things.

Let's move on to hazing. In the next category of questionable initiation activities, 20 percent of the students told us that this is what they did. That translates to about 60,000 students nationally. By definition, these seem to be humiliating activities but not dangerous or potentially illegal activities. Examples they gave us: yelling, cursing, swearing; wearing embarrassing clothes; tattooing, piercing, head shaving; participation in exercise and athletics not related to their sport; association with specific people and not others; acting as a personal servant to players off the field; depriving themselves of food, sleep, or hygiene; consuming extreme spicy or disgusting concoctions.

The third category of initiation was strictly alcohol related. Forty percent of our students said they participated in these initiations. This came as a surprise to us. There were two things they told us in this category. The first is that 42 percent of the students consumed alcohol during recruiting—before they even enrolled at the institutions. The second thing we learned is that most—about half of the students—participated in drinking contests when they arrived on campus.

Finally, the fourth category of initiation that we consider hazing are other unacceptable initiation activities. Well over 20 percent of students said that they participated in this, which is about 70,000 nationally. By definition, from our work we defined this as activities that carry a high probability of danger or injury or could result in criminal charges. Let me give you a list: making prank calls; harassing others; destroying or stealing property; engaging in sexual acts; being tied up, taped up, or confined to small spaces; being paddled, whipped, beaten, or kicked; and the last one, being kidnapped or transported.

So if you add up those three that we call hazing, that means about 80 percent of the students were hazed and 60 percent were involved in alcohol-related ways. It might be easy for us as adults to discuss the questionable activities as ones of endurance, but one of the things we learned from our research was that in far too many instances, the humiliating and/or degrading activities and questionable activities, are a prelude to and predictor for more serious and more dangerous behaviors. That is, when you see what appears to be an

incident of silly behavior—doing push-ups outside of team practice or the team all has their heads shaved—we know that there's a 90-percent chance that those same athletes are going to do dangerous or illegal things. For example, for those who are forced to wear embarrassing clothes, they reported 85 percent of them are going to be involved in other forms of hazing.

As a side note, I believe it's interesting to note that of those students who admitted that they had been hazed, 12 percent of the students said, "Yes, I was hazed." However, 80 percent of them described these behaviors. They didn't say, "I was hazed," but they described the behaviors that I just ran through.

We've also learned that hazing is not something that suddenly starts when the student enters college. This is probably the most startling thing we picked up. Of those students who admitted to hazing, 42 percent said they were hazed in high school and 5 percent said they were hazed in middle school. This is our next study.

Today's session is aimed at developing positive student-athlete behavior. So in our survey, we asked participants: "What suggestions do you have to decrease hazing?" Three categories emerged. First of all, send a clear message about antihazing in your policies and education and enforcement. Secondly, accept responsibility and integrity on the part of athletes, team captains, coaches and administrators. Third, offer team-building initiation rites facilitated by coaches and other adults.

Let's take a look at how this has affected Alfred University. Last fall, Jim Moretti, our athletics director, and his folks came up with strategies for hazing prevention. We have copies of this study at the table. If by some chance we run out of them and this is something you're interested in, I would ask that you send Jim Moretti your card and we'll make sure that you get a copy. But we came up with seven strategies, and I'd like to share those with you.

First, and probably the most important, strong disciplinary and corrective measures for known causes of hazing. We have a record at Alfred University for taking strong action. After the last incident, we suspended two players from Alfred University, we removed six from the team, canceled their next game, implemented educational programs and created a judicial hearing board for hazing incidents. We developed a policy for student-athletes regarding conduct, alcohol consumption and hazing. Each athlete is required to sign that they understand and agree to it.

The second strategy deals with athletic behavioral and academic standards guiding athletic improvement. We have developed a written policy guiding all students and coaches regarding overnight recruitment visits. Each coach is required to meet with each student prior to the recruiting visitation to review the policy and our expectations. Coaches are required to screen potential recruits for behavioral problems as well as academic performance.

The third strategy involves alternative bonding and recreation

events for our teams to prevent hazing. Each student is required to have been in only two alternative bonding events before the start of the season.

The fourth strategy calls for law enforcement involvement in monitoring, investigating and prosecuting hazing incidents. We have immediately notified law enforcement in the past of any suspected hazing incidents and will continue to do so. In our state and 40 others, it's illegal; therefore, we have a responsibility to do that.

The fifth strategy recommends clear staff expectations in athletics for monitoring and enforcing the hazing policy. Each coach's written evaluation includes a section related to eliminating negative student-athlete behavior both on and off the field.

The sixth strategy is being scheduled to join an NCAA CHAMPS/Life Skills Program in the year 2000.

The seventh and last is mandatory educational workshops on both alcohol and hazing for all students. I guess those are described in category "F." I'm sure they'll be delighted to talk to you later on if you have questions on those.

In closing, I'd like to reiterate that at Alfred University we feel that athletes need to earn their places on the teams, but they should do so on the basis of skill, not at the expense of their dignity, their self-worth, and under the threat of dangerous or illegal activities. The prices have been too high. Thank you. (Applause)

Megan Stevens (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): At this time, I would like to introduce Rob Morrissey, a member of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Rob graduated from Vassar College in 1998 where he competed in soccer for four years. Following graduation, Rob served a one-year internship with the Western Athletic Conference. He is currently a graduate student studying management at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Please welcome Rob. (Applause)

Rob Morrissey (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): It is my pleasure to now introduce Michael Josephson. Mr. Josephson had successful years in business, law and education before founding the non-profit Joseph and Edna Josephson Institute of Ethics, named for his parents. Through the institute, based in Marina Del Rey, California, Mr. Josephson founded the Character Counts Coalition, a partnership of almost 400 educational and youth-serving organizations. Through recognition of his work, Mr. Josephson was given the American Award for Integrity in 1996 by former President Ronald Reagan.

Character Counts aims to restore the opening tradition of amateur athletic competition by programs for players, officials and coaches. Through his programs and commentary, Mr. Josephson has become one of the most sought-after teachers and speakers on the subjects of ethics and character. He does more than 50 programs per year on leaders' dedication to business, government, journalism, law and the nonprofit community.

I am very pleased to introduce Mr. Michael Josephson to the

NCAA Division III membership. (Applause)

Michael Josephson: Thank you. When you heard I was a law professor from California, did your confidence in me go up? (Laughter) I'm used to lines like: Did you hear about in Washington they decided to substitute lawyers for white rats for scientific experiments? They had three reasons: There's more lawyers than white rats; you don't form emotional attachments to lawyers; and there's some things that even rats won't do. (Laughter)

I'm delighted to be able to talk to you in this context. Character Counts is relatively new, but very important to the kind of work we're trying to do in the area of sports. We started out with Character Counts doing work with the schools—largely high schools and middle school and elementary schools—to try to see if we couldn't do a more-effective job about finding a common site to build character that would avoid all the different theories of whose that is, what that means, and the ideological splits from the left to the right, religious versus secular community.

It became very obvious that sports are a very logical context in which an enormous amount of values are formed. Both in participating and watching sports, values are formed. There's no question that America is largely a sports culture. So we were commissioned by the U.S. Olympic Committee to do a program for coaches and character building. I'm going to share with you some of that and some of the insights we've gained in that process.

I think it's important to get back to what's important. When I think about character building, I start to think of it because of my four daughters who are at home right now. When I think of the kind of guys they may date, if it's an athlete, I don't want to be nervous about it. I want to make this relevant because to me character is about the kind of people we produce, the kind of character they have, whether they would be welcome in your home, whether you would be proud to have them as sons- or daughters-in-law, whether or not you see them as the parents of your grandchildren or nieces or nephews. Character is a very important issue.

So to me, when we're talking about character building, we're talking about producing the kind of people who will be suitable for the people we love. Sports are one of the primary vehicles to help engender those kinds of qualities.

To start with, I think it's useful to say what the real mission and goal of the sports program is and where does character building fit into that? How would we be able to be more proficient. We have to start out with the notion of values. We've already said that sports affects values. We want to talk about values. We want the school to be built on good values.

So let's be clear what we mean by values. Values are core desires, beliefs and principles that motivate actions and shape the character of individuals and institutions. Every institution has a values system. Every individual has a values system. But we often have two

different kinds of values systems. We have our stated values, which are the values that we say we have. For instance, you must know some people who say family first, that's my first item, but they work so hard they never see their family. So what we know is there's a difference between stated values and operational values. Operational values are the values that we actually have revealed by our decisions.

In sports, there is often a gap between stated and operational values. Every mission statement I've ever seen in any educational institution—high school, many colleges that I know, and including the Olympic program—always talks about the character-building dimension of sports. How else could we justify all the resources, unless we really believed it was intrinsic to education. So we have a clear notion that's stated on here.

There is, of course, a significant departure at various levels and in various sports between the operational values. Where does the value of winning fit in with an educationally oriented program? Are we trying to learn from winning or to get something from winning? Would it simply be one of the kinds of issues that we have when others are present? Clearly, consistency between stated and operational values is a matter of integrity. And that's where we have to start. Consistency.

One of the questions I often get is: "You're talking about values and ethics. What are ethics?" This man was about to die and he calls on his other three closest friends. He says, "Look, I've got an odd request, but I want your promise. I'm going to give you each \$20,000, but I want you to put the money in my coffin after I go." They try to talk him out of it. They said, "What's the point of that?" He says, "Look, I want some spending money for the after life." They said, "You're not going to need spending money." He says, "I don't know that. I want to take the down-side risk. You know, there's no down side to me. You're my friends. Will you do it or not?" So they reluctantly promise.

He gives them the \$20,000 each and sure enough, he dies. Three days later they each walk by the coffin and slip in an envelope. The first person says, "I've got a confession to make. I didn't put in all the money. I took out \$5,000 to give to the poor. I just couldn't see burying all that money."

The second said, "I'm relieved to hear you say that. I didn't put in all the money, either. I was his accountant. I put his entire estate in order before he died, but I never had a chance to bill him. I figure he owed me a minimum of \$10,000, so I just took out the money he owed me and I put the rest in."

The third person looks at the other two and said, "I can't believe you. We solemnly promised him, he was our very best friend. I want you both to know my word's my bond. That's why I gave him a check for the full amount." (Laughter)

The reason I think that story is important when we talk about the issue of values is because part of the problem is everybody says

they value ethics. Everybody. Every organization. I've done all kinds of speeches for every imaginable organization, from the CIA to journalists to you name it. And I've never met anybody who said I'm strong and I'm proud. The fact is everyone is ethical in his or her own eyes.

My story is illustrated by those three people, each of whom effectively broke their promise, but they had a reason. One person said it's not for me, I'm benefiting someone else; the other person said I have a right, I'm only getting what's coming to me; and the third is a kind of legalism. I think you'll find all three forms of rationalization operational in sports programs throughout the United States.

Obviously, Division I has some of the more severe problems. The gaps are wider in many respects because of the pressures and the money and the like. But we see them in high schools and even in the middle school programs. Between institutions that say they care about the student and they care about the student's education and they care about institutional reputation, and yet decisions actually seem to be game-by-game, sport-by-sport, winning kinds of decisions that send a very different value message.

So part of the issue is to realize that one of the strengths in Division III is you're not, at least you're not supposed to be, in the day-to-day hurly-burly. You're not giving out trial scholarships. You're not trying to set up programs simply to get national recognition and great finances from winning. You're in it so the sport could be a sport again. But even in this context, there are risks that individuals involved in the sport are not necessarily living up to the values that you think are the highest values.

Here are some things you should know about students today who are coming into your programs. These are just general national figures. Seventy percent of high-school students and middle-school males said they hit a person within the last 12 months because they were angry. I think that's an important figure because one of our concerns in character development in general, if we see a special problem in sports, is a lot of them have not learned the concept of restraint and of personal restraint and it ends up in violence.

When you're talking about 70 percent who have hit someone in anger within the last 12 months, you're dealing with a predisposition to use force in some way. We all know sports situations create situations where people can get angry. Things happen on the field and off the field where somebody gets angry. You therefore have to be sensitive to the fact that coming into your programs, there may be this predisposition toward violence.

Twenty-four percent of the high schoolers and 18 percent of the middle schoolers took a weapon to school at least once in the past year. If you combine weaponry and anger, then you begin to see some of the problems and some of the things we've seen at Columbine and other places. The fact of the matter is that so far—knock on wood—it's not affected any college program that we know. But we do see a

great deal of violence amongst each other, the males upon their female girlfriends and the like. We have to be concerned with propensity toward violence.

I'm not here stating the cause of that propensity is sports, although I'm not certain it helps. Certainly, the level of violence that people often see as reflected in professional sports and very high-profile collegiate sports, often seems to glorify violence. Especially some sports like ice hockey that obviously has violence built in as one of the entertainment features of the program.

So one has to ask: What is the role in sports in helping to create this? But I'm more concerned with what is the role of sports to help eliminate it. What can you do to be more self-conscious about this and to know that young people are placed in difficult situations that challenges their self-restraint, and that coaches in the athletic programs must be incredibly self-conscious about trying to develop in them a sense of restraint so the propensity towards violence does not act out.

Forty-eight percent of the high-school graduating class of 1995 used an illicit drug at least once, up from 40 percent in 1992. So drug use is coming upward again. Twenty-six percent of high-school seniors used an illicit drug at least once a month during their senior year. So again, although there is some evidence that athletes tend to use these drugs less, it's not zero; it's just proportionately less. Therefore, we have to again be concerned about the incoming class of athletes who have come from where the use of drugs is still far too common and therefore may very well be something that invades in some way or another your program.

Twenty-two percent of high schoolers say they have been drunk at school at least once in the past year. That's one in five who have been drunk at school in the past year. Generally speaking, does drinking go up or down once they enter college? There's an indication drinking goes up. It's a new liberation time for a lot of young people. So if this would happen in high school, is it not possible that this is going to happen in collegiate situations? Whether or not it deliberately and literally happens in games and practices is, of course, possible. Student-athletes nevertheless are students and young people first. At least, this is a propensity worth being aware of.

Nine percent of the middle schoolers came to school drunk at least once. By the way, if you want to know what the toxic cocktail is to society, you have a group that has a propensity to use violence when they get angry, you have access to guns, and you have intoxication in a significant number of situations. All of that is a toxic cocktail that we all have to be concerned with. It's a backdrop to the kind of character development responsibilities and opportunities you have at your schools.

We know that 400,000 unmarried teens give birth each year. Many high-profile male athletes have fathered one or more children while in their teens. Some of the biggest stars and the most scorers

have fathered multiple children with multiple women out of wedlock. What message does this say about responsibility? What message does this send about the kinds of hopefully meaningful and enduring relationships that we want to create? Are we aware that this, too, is part of the context in which you and your sports program are going to be concerned with in character building? These are the givens that you have.

Three million teenagers contract sexually transmitted diseases each year. Seventy percent of all high-school students admit they have cheated on an exam at least once in the past year. Seventy percent admitted it. By the way, that's across the board. The average is higher for those going to college. In fact, the more academically competitive they were, the more likely they were to have cheated. This is in the last 12 months.

There's two implications of that for your sports program. One is obvious. One good way to be declared ineligible is to cheat. We find out that your young people cheated on exams. The University of Minnesota knows about that. But the second thing is that cheaters cheat. People who cheat on one thing tend to cheat on others. So whether it's any other kind of a goal, whether it's a potential association with gamblers, whether it's dealing with drinking, whether it's recruiting violations, whatever. You have to understand that the propensity to cheat is something that manifests itself in many ways. These are only the ones who admitted to cheating.

About one in three college students admit they cheated on an exam in the past year. It's a little harder to cheat in college. There are far more essay tests and the like. This doesn't take into account the Internet. This is exam cheating. This is cheating on examinations. Once you start adding papers and the Internet, you have a whole new world of complexity.

Now, is this a factor we're concerned with in sports? Isn't sports about integrity and playing fair and playing straight? Well, if you have such a disposition about cheating, high-profile cheating scandals in college athletics are recurrent.

Forty-seven percent of all male high-school students admitted they stole something from a store in the past year. By the way, we don't find any significant demographic differences here. It's not like we're finding that kids going to college are better than the ones not going to college or the wealthy kids are better than the nonwealthy kids. This is an across-the-board demographic. Literally half of them admit they stole something.

About one in five college students—college students—said they shoplifted within the last year. As we know, nearly a dozen UCLA football players were convicted of committing fraud to get their permits to be in the handicapped zone. That's the kind of things that might flow from the habits and behaviors the young people are forming well before you see them. But it is the setting in which you have to think about. Are you going to change that, are you going to deal

with it, or are you going to find your own program to become a victim of these predispositions?

Keep in mind about this self-admitted cheating and stealing. These numbers are clearly low, because these are the thieves and liars who admitted they lied and stole. The real thieves and liars wouldn't even lie about that. So therefore, these figures are conservative and have been replicated many, many times. We take this survey, this last one was over 20,000 students every two years. In fact, it's going up slightly every year. It jumped back from the cheating record of 64 to 70 percent over the last two years.

So is character building important? Is it needed? Do universities and colleges today have to spend some time being concerned not only whether somebody's smart and whether they're good? I think the answer is "yes." Teddy Roosevelt said that to educate a person in the mind but not in morals is to educate a menace to society. I think today we have to recognize that it is a central function of education to help people develop sound and good values that make them constructive citizens.

What's the student-athlete ideal? The rhetoric and realities. At many institutions there's a substantial gap between the rhetoric and the reality of the student-athlete, especially in those sports that generate revenue or are the subject of special school pride. I know we all may be feeling a little sanctimonious about this. Not our schools. We don't need that. You may be right.

But I've seen high schools, that when they have the big game, there's pressures on the faculty person to be sure the quarterback is eligible to play. That's where the compromises are made. We're seeing that everywhere pride is involved. It's not only money, it's glory and pride. It needs to be sensitive to the fact that sometimes in recruiting you're not going to be asked what kind of student this person will be, but can you contribute to our sports team.

Along with that, direction begins to change and at least you become vulnerable to the possibility between your stated values and your actual values. Where schools are highly competitive and concerned with winning, the tendency is to treat studenthood in a minimalist way. Stay eligible and maintain acceptable graduation rates as a minimalist. What is the real student ideal? That you're a student first and an athlete second. The reality often is you've got to at least be a student to stay eligible, so let's be sure you at least meet the minimal requirements, with any real effort to say you're a student number one.

You know, it's interesting, if you take the context of a parent and you're thinking of your own child, you're thinking long-term. While you know they may be enjoying sports and some might even have a minimal shot at making a living at it for a while in terms of a player, the fact is you want them to be prepared for a life after sports. So all parents virtually would say to their kids to study first or make their children discontinue their sport or outside activity.

I remember when we used to have a concept as a local apprentice, in terms of the university and the recognition, that there was some responsibility of a university or college when we decided to say, "Do we care about students the same way the parents would care about them? Are we manifesting that here?"

There are five models of sports. In your various colleges, each of these models may be operational at different times, but what model sports you have has a lot to do with the values you're going to be conveying and the values that you will be reflecting in the sports programs itself.

The first model in sports is recreation. When I was off playing on the street in Buffalo, that was just for fun. There is a dimension of sport that's just for fun. Of course, intramurals may reflect that still in the college and university settings. Where most people participating are really doing it just for fun. It's recreational.

A second model is the competition model. I really call it the Olympic model. It's just to see who's fastest, who's strongest, who's best. There is a competitive discipline, but not necessarily an unhealthy one, that wants to know how I compare to others. Therefore, competition itself can become a focus of many sports programs. That, of course, is a focus on individual performance, not necessarily comparative results, but you want to go to individual peak performance to see how good I can be.

The third model that obviously concerns the most here is the education model. That is that the purpose and the objective of sports program is education, physical, mental, social and moral development of the young person.

It's not irrelevant to point out the other two, although I think they're less relevant in Division III, as they should be, but they are certainly some of the factors that are corroding sports today nationally. The first of those two is the career model. Where young people are thinking of this as a job, as a career, as a way to fame and fortune.

Some have very unrealistic attitudes about their chances of ever really making a living out of this but they see it as occurring. Their parents see getting a scholarship as the main purpose. There are in high schools today all kinds of things going on, including, for instance, a relatively common practice happening in some states of holding a good athlete back in the ninth grade so he or she will be stronger and bigger by the time they reach the 11th and 12th grade. It would be obvious that one year in their life at that stage is a significant thing.

We begin to think where are our priorities? But there are some parents who say if that's my only shot at a scholarship and my kid getting into the pros, then that's what we'll do. We have to be sensitive to that.

There's another model we see more and more of and that's coaches who don't see themselves as teachers. They see themselves as career coaches. They see themselves as people trying to climb the

ladder or achieve ever-increasing levels of coaching. That's understandable; coaching is a profession. But the only way to do that is not to be a great teacher, it's to be a winner.

So the fact is that the more and more you emphasize coaching, you now have coaches—Steve Spurrier—making \$2 million. There are more and more coaches now making a million dollars a year. It's not unusual to see that the same mental attitude that has invaded young people's attitudes toward sports has affected coaches' attitudes. Career values are affecting the way sports are conducted and played and who's hired and what your standards of performance are.

The final one is sports as a business. We know sports is a business. We just have to accept that. It is a business. It's a money-making business. So you're not surprised when it functions as a business. If a rule change will help bring in the fans, that's fine. If keeping a little violence in, as they are doing now with hockey, which clearly is keeping it in because it wouldn't be impossible to take out, is good for business, they'll keep it in. The scary thing is that we all know we're seeing more and more of that attitude invade the Olympic movement and the collegiate movements as well.

Even in some high schools now, sports are becoming big business. Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola are falling all over each other bidding for contracts at various high-school districts to lock in the students. Nike and Adidas fight to see who they're going to sign up. As a result, commercialization is starting very, very early. This can only have the impact of changing the values. Whereas the recreational and competitive and educational theories of sport are all athlete centered. They're all for the athlete in some form or another. The other two are money centered. That's one of the concerns that we at least ought to be sensitive to.

The NCAA says its purpose is educational leadership, physical fitness, excellence to athletics, participation as a recreational pursuit. Citizenship Through Sports Alliance says its goal is to focus on the ethical behavior in the communities that encourage and support participation in sport as a positive character-building activity. Of course, the NHL is part of the Citizenship Through Sports Alliance. I guess we don't demand much of our members in our organizations today. But the fact of the matter is that many of the pro leagues, in fact all of the major pro leagues, are part of the Citizenship Through Sports Alliance. Yet we haven't seen any significant reform that indicates they care about this other than lip service.

The NAIA—a competitive organization—is articulating very well what we think of when we're looking at the collegiate notion toward sports. It says the purpose is to promote the education and development of students through intercollegiate athletic participation based on our commitment to high standards and to the principle that participation in athletics serves as an integral part of the whole educational process.

I'm going to skip some of these others. By the way, for folks who

want to get copies of some of these overheads, they will be posted on the Web site sportsmanship.org.

Look at the American Football Coaches Association's statement. The function of the coach is to educate students through the participation in the game of football. It's primary, basic function must always be upheld. The idea is that the coach is a teacher. The coach should never place the value of winning above that of instilling the highest desirable ideals and character traits in its players. That's from the American Football Coaches Association. I'd like to see that transferred to the behavior of American football coaches and those organizations that are monitoring American football.

Let's look at sports as an education. Here is the student-athlete ideal. The athlete is a student first. Academic goals and responsibilities must be placed above athletic ones. It is the responsibility of both the academic and athletic departments to assure that the educational goals of the institution are given top priority in the sports program and in the activities and attitudes each are bearing. That sounds so basic. How is it that in so many instances we're seeing people graduating from major universities who later claim to be illiterate?

I was just talking to a law firm. They have an athlete who was not paying his child support and they wondered why he didn't get a job. He said, "because I can't read." They said, "but you went to Auburn." He said, "yeah, but I was a great athlete." The real responsibility for that is not on the coaches. It's on the faculty and administration. If any athlete is going to any institution and succeeding at that institution while unable to read, something is dreadfully wrong with those classes, the grading and the evaluation process.

Every single teacher who was involved should be held accountable. Yet, I have never seen one university that has the guts to say I'm going to go back and take the transcript and find out about each and every course. Some of you may remember Dexter Manley. About 10 years ago, he also testified before Congress that he graduated and was illiterate, never learned to read. Why don't we go back and check every course they took and see who their teacher was and what grade there was and ask the honest question of our institution: "How could this have happened? How could so many of us have given a passing grade to someone who cannot read effectively?"

It's either saying something about our educational standards, which is depressing, or saying something about our integrity, which is depressing. In either case, I would argue that the institutions have responsibility. Unfortunately, the highly competitive sports programs run by highly competitive coaches, and sometimes athletic directors, are going to always be pushing for more and more to help their athletic program. It is the job of the administrators to be sure that this is kept in proportion. It is the job of the administrators, I would argue, to keep the dignity of the sports program.

We talked about violence, for example. We have coaches who will

throw chairs on the field, scream at referees, push and hit. How can any institution tolerate that? How can you tolerate that if these people are ambassador not only of your institution, but of the sport itself? Yet, some of the most high-profile institutions will tolerate it if the coach has a winning record. So it's not surprising that we have a basketball player, Latrell Sprewell, who strangled his coach. I used to teach criminal law. He would be guilty of attempted murder or at least felonious assault for certain. But he then was moved to a different team and now has a \$70 million-plus contract because he still knows how to dunk the ball.

The values that we're conveying in sports and the values that the administrators of sports programs are conveying, by tolerating and accepting unacceptable kinds of behaviors as long as people produce results, is a serious corrosive value. I think that makes it harder for you to develop character in individual students.

One of the things we've done that we're very excited about, and on the table you have, is called the Arizona Sports Report. The whole purpose was to try to bring together people important in the sports community. On the back of it, it tells you who all was there. There were some pretty prominent people—from presidents of universities to some major athletic directors to some of the great coaches of all time—say what the fundamental principles that we need to return to in sport are.

To a greater or lesser extent, they may be relevant to your institution, but it's terribly important you look at it. We hope you'll want to sign onto this. We're going to be listing on our Web site every institution that has endorsed and adopted this program and hopefully hold their feet to the fire in living up to it.

But one of the stages is this: In recruiting, educational institutions must specifically determine that the athlete is seriously committed to getting an education and has or will develop the academic skills and character to succeed. Would that change a rule? It certainly would at a lot of Division I-A schools. It may or may not change any activities throughout some of your Division III schools.

But why should you take someone who isn't even interested in education, who only wants to play sports, and bring them to your institutions? We'll say, "I'm giving them an opportunity to learn." But a lot of people don't want that opportunity to learn. Why don't we dispense that great benefit to people who really want to learn? At least those athletes who have no interest in education and will likely leave the institution early and possibly embarrass them with their off-field conduct ought not to necessarily be at institutions of higher learning. But here's one of the most important findings. John Wooden was one of the people who was at our program. He was the one who suggested this principle and everybody adopted it very quickly. Bob Costas was also at this summit. There was only about 45 people. It was 2½ days, fairly intense. Costas asked John Wooden in a public forum about his last game and why he retired. And Wooden just casually said, "Well,

in the last game I ever taught . . ." And that was for all of us such a powerful reference to the notion that the profession of coaching is the profession of teaching.

In addition to teaching the mental and physical dimension of their sport, coaches, through words and example, must also strive to build the character of their athletes by teaching them to be trustworthy, respectful, responsible, fair, caring and good citizens. Why is this not a source of evaluation of your coaches? If this is really the goal—to make your coach a teacher—you just keep looking at wins and losses, shouldn't the coach be evaluated like the rest of your faculty is, on the basis of their production to the educational community? And that would include how they're doing as teachers in this regard.

The objective of sports programs should be to develop positive life skills that will help participants become personally successful and socially responsible. I'm very pleased to say, referring to the CHAMPS program, for instance, that Character Counts has been working with the CHAMPS program to integrate all these character-building elements to make it be even a stronger program than it is now.

The essential elements of character building and ethics in sports are embodied in the concept of sportsmanship and six core values. I've repeated them before: trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and good citizenship. When the people up here on the board decided to isolate specific words and versions, they did it because they wanted to have specific outcomes that would be the target of your character-building programs. So you have to ask yourself: What are we doing within our program to help make young people more trustworthy? What are we doing within our program to help young people become more respectful, to be more responsible, to have a higher degree of respect for fairness and fair play, to act in a caring manner and simply good citizenship?

It's the duty of sports leadership, including coaches, athletic administrators, program directors and game officials to promote sportsmanship and foster good character by teaching, enforcing, advocating and modeling these ethical principles. That is the fundamental strategy we recommend. We call them team concepts: teach, enforce, advocate and model.

If you want to do a better job at character building, the first thing you have to do is specify what character looks like. What do you want your young people to think? What do you want them to do? Do you want to specify the values? We specify the six. You may want to have a different list. You may want to have something else. But one way or the other, if you want to create it, you've got to start with defining it and giving them a picture of what it looks like.

Second, you have to enforce it with student codes of conduct. Without student codes of conduct, there's no specific method of not only specifying the values, but ultimately putting enough clout behind them to enforce it. An unenforced value is no value at all. We

know that. In sports, when we find a referee does not enforce a rule, within minutes adaptations will be made. So everybody says okay, he's not calling holding today. We see that we are constantly adapting in life to the level of enforcement rather than the level of what's right. It's a sad reality.

Most of you probably know because you're sports followers, but how many of you know that when we won the Women's World Cup, that we won it by cheating? If you think I'm exaggerating, the goalie said, "It's only cheating if you get caught." What happened was this, we won by the block of a penalty kick, as you recall. Our goalie stepped out a full three steps, deliberately and on purpose. In fact, she says, "I tested the referee on the first penalty kick and she didn't call it. So by the second penalty kick, I was able to get out three steps and that's the one I blocked."

The rule is absolutely clear in soccer. On a penalty kick, you cannot leave the line until the ball is kicked. She was interviewed afterwards and she said, "Yeah, I did it. But it's only cheating if you get caught." Now, I don't mean to pick on Briana Scurry for this necessarily. But I want to say something about the sports ideal. If that's really okay, then how about pulling shirts or helmets? How about all the other dirty tricks that we can teach young people as long as they can get away with it? Where are you going to draw the line?

One of the interesting things is when I announce this to many audiences, I get kind of a ho hum, come on, if that's cheating, big deal. Yeah? Now just imagine if the Chinese did it against us. Come on. You don't think there would be an outcry, an incredible outcry, I don't believe what they did to us.

In fact, I got a call from the editor of the L.A. Times sports section because he was also a participant on the Arizona board. He was really thinking about whether he was going to write this story because he didn't want to rain on their parade. It was one of the great moments—and it's a great team. They're great young women and they've done a fabulous job. I don't mean to negate any of that by the fact that I feel very uncomfortable about our attitude toward winning.

But what he did, before he decided to print this in the L.A. Times, and some of you didn't even read it in your newspapers because many of the other newspapers refused to pick it up, was he checked the Chinese papers. The L.A. Times has bureaus in China. In the main Chinese newspapers—Virginia was telling me about the Chinese newspaper in Shanghai—it was on the front page. It showed pictures of our goalie in three sequences stepping away from the goal and finally blocking it, with a headline that was equivalent to "We Was Robbed." What is it about our attitudes toward sports? What are we teaching? What are we enforcing?

If we want to state that the rule is: "Get away with whatever you can," let's make that the rule. Let's have the guts to do that. Let's teach kids how to cheat effectively. Anything worth doing is worth

doing well. Therefore, the proficiency is what's important. We must enforce, we must advocate, and obviously model.

This is, by the way, on the Web sites. To get the Powerpoint overheads, go to sportsmanship.org. If you want any other information about the Character Counts Program, it's just charactercounts.org.

Let me close with this, because we're about to do some very specific assignments. I'm going to come back and try to sum this up. The task of character building is far more complex than the rhetoric. But parents do it all the time. It is silly to say we can't do it because we're too old. You're never too old to learn something. As a matter of fact, some of the most significant studies show that the most important value choices young people make occur as they become emancipated. In other words, as they begin to start making decisions for their own life. Even though they have a lot of guidance for that by what they've learned before, they haven't made the decisions yet.

That guidance comes from what you do and do not do in your programs, whether or not you train your coaches just like you train any teachers to understand the mechanics of character building. There are mechanics of character building in the same way that there are mechanics for individual sport. You need to hold them responsible for representing, for teaching, enforcing, advocating and modeling this.

What you do will have a huge impact on the lives of these athletes and everybody they ever interact with. Most athletes who you interview about the most important person in their life lists at least one coach. Coaches have an impact on the lives of people who are very concerned with sports that is unrivaled by most other teachers and any people who could be influential. Your goal is to find a way to mobilize that.

Now, what are our tasks for discussion at the tables? These are the four things we want you to discuss, but the last one's the most important. So if you're allocating your time, please understand we're hoping you'll end with some kind of action plan. All these papers are going to be collected and assembled and the NCAA is going to give you a report on these kinds of things so you'll have the benefit of all these table-top discussions. You're going to have about 40 minutes to do this.

The first is, regarding sportsmanship and character building, what would you like to see more or less of? I want you to think of it in three categories: from the administration, from the coaches, and from players. Second, what are the barriers to enhancing character-building aspects in your sports program? Third, what role should a code of ethical conduct play? And the most important, because this is the thing that hopefully will be helpful when it's published later to everyone, is list at least three specific things your institution did do to improve the character-building impact of your sports programs.

If you'd like to begin now, I'm going to wander and walk around and try to hear what you're saying. Then we'll try this out. Thank you. (Applause)

If you only have one or two people at your table, we'd really appreciate it if you would combine with another table. Thank you and I'll be back shortly.

[Note: Roundtable discussions were held from 2:33 to 3:11 p.m.]

Mr. Josephson: Okay, if I can have your attention. Thank you. Obviously, an exercise like this is always a challenge when it hits you cold, but I think you'll all be surprised at some of the good ideas you'll see when it is all put together and published and mailed. I want to say something about the process and some of the things I've heard and tie it up if I can. Hopefully, you'll have some vision as to what you decide to do when you go back to your own campus.

This is all good and nice talk, but each of you is going to make a decision to do something on your campus—and please do so with the theory that you don't have to be sick to get better. The implication isn't that you're doing a bad job or that you're horrible people or that your institution is a failure. In fact, one of the things we've learned in this whole ethics/character-developing business is that it's a lot easier to make a good organization better than a bad organization good. It's a lot easier to make a good person better than it is to make a bad person good. So while people often say you're lecturing to the choir here, that kind of misses the point about potential for improvement.

The interesting thing is the process itself. When I asked you to just think about it, I went to a lot of tables. Almost everybody wanted to skip over the first step to get to the last. That's the typical academic response. I taught law for 20 years. I know your attitude was let's get on with it. What's your end product? You forget sometimes there's a logic to a process.

The first question was asking you to think specifically about outcomes. What specific things would you like to see more of and less of with respect to the various constituents? Some were very quick to say you should have added officials to that list as well. I think when you do that, you begin to start planning your lesson plan more effectively.

When I was in academics, I wrote a book called "Learning and Evaluation in Law School." The focus was on learning and evaluation. Clearly, the first part was stating your objective. Instructional objectives is the very first thing you're taught in education school. Many of us just got to teach because we were good in our subject area. I think that focus goes exactly to the importance of character development. The more precise you are by knowing what you want to see and what you want to change, the more effective you are at strategizing it.

For example, let's say one of your problems is profanity, or you don't like the way young people are treating each other or their coaches with disrespect. So you focus on that and you know what you're going to enforce. The more specific you are about the outcomes, the more likely you are to design a strategy that's truly de-

signed to achieve that outcome. Secondly, you now have a basis for evaluation.

One of the things I heard somebody say as I was going around to the tables was: "How are we going to know if they're a character teacher or not? It's easy to deal with the win/loss record, but how are we going to know whether they're a good teacher?" Well, how do you know whether somebody's a good English teacher? How do you know if they're a good teacher of Spanish? Come on, you do this all the time. You make subjective judgments based upon professional assessments—you are people who watch, who listen, who view.

If you really, really care, you'll start asking the constituents. You're the one to know what kind of character-building program you have. First of all, ask former and current athletes. Secondly, survey some of the coaches of the other teams. Survey the officials and even parents. You'll start getting a 360-degree kind of opinion.

The other thing that struck me is that somebody talked about the vagueness of this—it's just such a hopeless enterprise because if we really, really wanted coaches to be character builders, we'd have no way of assessment. You assess that all the time. My children have teachers. It doesn't take me very long to get a feel for what values that teacher is conveying to my kids and how she or anyone is in the classroom. The athletics director who watches a handful of practices, who talks to athletes, who hangs around will see. The issue isn't just separating bad coaches from good coaches, it's how to make good coaches better.

So I ask you to revisit in some ways as you go back home the question of: What is the ideal coach like? If some of you have had the benefit in your life of thinking of a coach you had who was a true model, saying this is the kind of person I wish all my coaches would be, then ask yourself what qualities did that person manifest? Don't assume they were natural or inherent. That coach may have developed those qualities over time. You, too, can teach and train and develop that in your coaches and in your athletes.

The other thing is to remember that your athletes are potential leaders and to give them leadership training and opportunities to speak to younger kids, and therefore enhance their own character-development issues.

Another vision I'd like to share with you is the notion of your sports program in general and everybody in it being an ambassador of your college. In fact, that's the biggest argument you can use as to why it's so important to win so many games, because we get this national image and help people come to our school and alumni—so obviously, there's a whole public relations thing tied up in how well your athletic programs do. Well, don't you think there's a whole public relations thing tied up in what kind of athletic program that represents?

Right now, if I mentioned the name Bobby Knight, what do you think of? Do you think of a winning basketball team at a great uni-

versity or possibly a coach who does not exercise self-control with enough consistency? If I say University of Minnesota, right now you're going to be thinking of the cheating scandal. Mention Florida State and you'll recall more than one problem with athletes with off-the-field conduct.

My point is not right now to blame those institutions. All I'm saying is the impressions that those institutions have conveyed to the world is affected as well by what kinds of stories and situations come out from those sports programs. If you truly thought of every coach and every athlete as an ambassador of the college, you would simply ask yourself what kinds of behavior do I want to encourage and discourage? That's what the student code of conduct is about in part—to help them understand the importance of that.

That's why this role modeling thing we argue is very clear. If you are an athlete, you are in a role-model function simply because it's highly visible. Charles Barkley aside, role modeling is not an optional position. You don't volunteer for it. You just are simply there because people want to be like you. If people want to be like you because of what you are or what you have, responsibility is attached to that. Whether you acknowledge them or not, the responsibility is attached. The only question is whether you meet them or not.

Also, I heard people talk about barriers—the whole culture is a barrier. What are we going to do? It's not just this, it's MTV, it's the journalism, it's the politicians, it's what happens in Washington. There's two ways to look at this. Either look at all those bad things as more obstacles or simply look at it as the landscape upon which you are performing a task.

The question isn't how can I build character when MTV promotes this and Washington promotes that. It's how can I promote character in view of the fact that Washington promotes this and MTV promotes that? Just treat what you think are barriers as simply the definition of the problem. Instead of being stymied by the problems, think about what am I going to do to overcome this?

One of the barriers is that there's no incentives for character building. The only way coaches tend to get hired, fired, promoted or rewarded is induced in one way or the other by their win and loss records. Okay, who decides that? Who decides what the incentive systems are? Could you not design different kinds of incentive systems? If you're concerned with character development and you're concerned with leadership, there are two styles. One might be negative sanctions for misbehavior.

What if, for instance, your coaches had a disincentive in their contracts for unsportsmanlike conduct calls or technical fouls or misbehavior of their athletes off the field. Maybe you could have a reward process if you go through a whole term and semester that is trouble free, just as you would with grades and grade-point averages. Graduation rates are only one small and final evaluation that hardly does the deed because we don't know what kind of education they got

along the process of graduating. More important is educational quality. Did these young people get a quality education? You want coaches who care about that. You will start to measure that by the different ways you encourage it.

You even have to be careful with that because you're dealing with people who love to gain in every system; that's sort of the mentality. So if you start grading GPAs, let's say you start giving incentives for GPAs. You better be careful what courses they pick, right? Because one of the sure things they'll do is pick courses so we can get high grades, let's pick the easy graders. So you have to acknowledge there's no system that you can devise that someone can't corrupt. The problem is trying to find people of integrity and your own good sense of vigilance to say we're serious about this; this is what we want you to achieve.

By the way, does that mean that performance in winning is irrelevant? No. Because you've got to believe that coaching has some impact on performance. Confident, skilled coaches ought to improve the performance of their athletes. Therefore, you ought to be looking to see whether or not these coaches in fact are competent, skilled coaches who are getting the most out of their athletes.

But on the other hand, you want them to have balance and not view that as a barrier. Remove your barriers to see if you can find incentives. One of the things you'll find within the Arizona board document is a whole state of implementation strategies that was also worked out to try to suggest specific ways to accomplish these goals.

Let's look for a moment about the quick list of the problems that you might have to address, because some of you have more or less than a complete list. First of all is what seems to me is integrity issues—fidelity to the academic and character-building objectives in a must-win business culture. Your culture may be much less than that at your individual school, but you have to understand the education of your own coaches and athletes who are in this must-win business culture.

One of the things I think we underestimate is how much sheer ego and pride is attributed to the must-win-at-any-cost mentality. We constantly think it's an issue of money. Take away the money and many of these people were every bit as competitive. As I was a freshman practicing law, I wanted to win. We were competitive because it was the general nature of wanting to win. So keep in mind that the culture about winning isn't truly about incentives and disincentives, it's about priorities and values.

So what you want to do is not deemphasize winning so much and try to say it's only a game. That demeans people who make a livelihood or try to be good at this practice. You don't want to say it's only a game, but you say there are other things more important than winning. The pursuit of victory with honor is the phrase that we're urging you to think of over and over again because it's trying to win that's important. It's trying to get the win that's important. But

without the honor, you lose everything. But that's very difficult in a must-win society.

I was at the Olympic games in '96 and I saw Nike—not my favorite sponsor—who had an ad that said, "You do not win the silver, you lose the gold." Now, what kind of mentality is that where even the second-best athlete in the entire world is made to feel like a loser and that's the psychology? Character and competency of coaches is a big issue, as is the notion of cheating and gamesmanship. The character and competency of coaches is an administrative responsibility. We just had a situation at the University of Alabama. A coach paid a very serious fine for sexual harassment—the school paid \$250,000 to \$270,000. There was some talk about him losing his job. The athletics director lost his job. But the coach ended up 10 and 2 and just got a two-year extension.

I'm not saying whether he should have gotten the extension or not; I don't know enough about the internal facts. But without a clear statement by the university that we don't tolerate this and it isn't just because he's a good coach, the message that's being sent is the character of our coach is much less important than his competency.

My guess is that if it happened in Washington recently, that may not be a total surprise. Remember, the public was asked to vote about how important character was. Many said as long as he keeps the trains running on time, I don't care what he does in his personal life. Whatever you think about that in the presidency, if you truly believe your coach is a teacher, you have to ask yourself if you would keep this person as a superintendent of schools at a high school? Would you keep him as a high-school teacher? As a university president? Should the standards of character for coaches be lower than in any of those situations?

Cheating and gamesmanship. Gamesmanship is the theory that winning is what's important and you do it by bending or breaking the rules. That's what Briana Scurry did. It's the outcome standard that's in our mentality. As far as integrity, it's playing the game the way the game was written. You want a rule changed, you change the rules. Sportsmanship, on-the-field conduct, everything from taunting, screaming, yelling, you see all that. Modeling, off-the-field conduct, it's a huge issue now. It's almost in the news weekly.

What are you telling them at the beginning of the program? What are you telling them during the program to make them understand if they want to play, they've got to behave themselves and be good ambassadors for the program? Parents, are you having appropriate discipline? Nobody knows when somebody does something wrong who's fair. You've got to think about this ahead of time in some meaningful way. Conduct of spectators and spirit groups, including parents is a huge issue. Who can control it? If you believe a coach is a teacher, that the field is a classroom and therefore everything that goes on in that classroom is your business, then you can control that with rules and policies and standards.

In your professional code of athlete relationships, make certain that coaches understand that sexual relations with athletes and things of that nature are very critical and serious. Excessive commercialism. What else are you willing to sell? If you watched the Sugar Bowl, you know who Nokia was because that logo was on every single player like it was a walking billboard. These minors were carrying logos of corporations as their soul. Soon they'll sell parts of their body, places for the logo. Finally, there are Title IX gender issues.

Let me conclude with this. The whole hope and notion for me, at least of Division III sports, is it's the area in which sports can be the purest in college. You don't have the same pressures. You don't have the same temptations. You don't have the same demands. At the same time, if you're not vigilant, it all goes in one direction. The tendency is to go downward, not upward, if you're not mentioned.

And I'll close with this story. It comes from the play "All My Sons." The relationship between the father and sons is the essential part. The son had always loved and admired the father, but he began to find out that the father had done some pretty shabby things in his life. So as the father feels the esteem slipping away, he says, "Son, I'm not worse than anybody else." The son looks at him and says: "I know, dad, but I thought you were better. You're supposed to be better." Please go out and be better.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Die: Thank you, Michael, for helping us to think about issues of value, character and ethics. These are issues of high importance to the Division III institutional representatives in this room.

I'd also like to thank all the participants, particularly the student-athletes and members of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We appreciate your work that was put into making this program possible. We must all work together daily with our student-athletes to foster more positive behavior. I trust and agree that today's sessions were a great start in that direction. I hope we can carry what we've learned back to our campuses and conferences and build on it.

Remember that this year's Convention formally opens with a general business session at 3:45, so we'll have to walk fast. Also, please remember that the honors dinner will begin at 7:30. Goodbye.

[The Forum was adjourned at 3:29 p.m.]

■ Division III Business Session

Monday Morning, January 10, 2000

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Division III Presidents Council Chair Ann Die, Hendrix College, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Ann Die (Hendrix College): Good morning and welcome to today's Division III business session. I am Ann Die, president of Hendrix College and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will chair the Division III business sessions.

I realize our configuration is not perfect. It seems some years we have rows so far back that you can't see the podium. This year, we may be experiencing the opposite extreme of being so spread out. We do have an advantage of having all the microphones at the front of the room, so you will not have to turn your head 360 degrees to see if there's someone else waiting at the microphone.

Joining me this morning are—I will ask them to stand as I call their names—Tom Courtice, president of Ohio Wesleyan University and vice-chair of the Presidents Council; John Biddiscombe, director of athletics at Wesleyan University and chair of the Division III Management Council; Lynda Calkins, director of athletics at Hollins University and vice-chair of the Management Council; Georgana Taggart, coordinator of parallel studies and faculty athletics representative at the College of Mount St. Vincent; Dan Dutcher, who serves as Division III chief of staff; Bridget Belgiovine, who serves as Division III assistant chief of staff; Chris Martin, who is a membership services representative at the national office. He is our Division III legislative liaison. Lynn Holzman is an NCAA legislative coordinator. Lynn and Chris will serve as our interpretive experts during our discussion of proposed legislation. Judson Taylor, who is president of the State University of New York at Cortland and a member of the Presidents Council. Jud will present the Presidents Council report in a few minutes. And Carlyle Carter, executive director of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and a member of the Management Council. He will present the Management Council report.

Also joining us is a court reporter whose name is Annisa Justice. She will help create an accurate record of our meeting. Some of you may remember Annisa as a long-time staff member from the NCAA's days in Kansas City. She will need when you go to the microphone your name and your institution.

One procedure we must dispense with is the need to adopt the Convention Notice and Convention Program before beginning our

business. Before I ask for a motion to accept the Notice and Program, I would like to point out that pages 4 through 6 of the Notice describe various corrections and editorial revisions. These are deemed not to be controversial in nature. However, we also will try to remind you of those corrections when we address the specific proposals.

If we vote to accept the Convention Notice and Program, we will vote on the proposals in the order they appear in those publications. So if you wish to reorder a proposal, now is the time to do so. Please note that any motion to reorder a proposal designated for roll-call vote also will have to be approved by roll call. Please note that by adopting the Notice and Program, you also are adopting the noncontroversial amendments in Appendix B. The deregulation phase has four amendments to discuss. These amendments all have been approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council and published in *The NCAA News*. We will not discuss any of them individually, unless you move to do so at this time.

I will now ask for a motion to adopt the Notice and the Program for the Division III business session so that we may proceed with our work.

[A motion to adopt the Convention Program was made, seconded and approved.]

Now I will review the timetable related to today's agenda. Part of it is to enter into the record what we intend to do today. Our job between now and 5 p.m. is to complete the portion of the Division III agenda identified on page 12 of the Program. We will meet this morning until noon, at which time we will break for lunch. After lunch, we will reconvene at 1:30 and meet until 5 p.m.

We will begin our business this morning by receiving reports from the Presidents Council and the Management Council. Next, we will vote on Division III legislation. We will consider a total of 45 legislative proposals over the next two days, but we will handle only 10 roll-call proposals today. When that time comes, I will turn over the gavel to John Biddiscombe. John will review the necessary information related to our voting procedures, and he will preside over our consideration of those proposals. After we complete our voting, and if time permits, we will take our morning break.

After our break, we will conclude our morning with two sessions. In our first session, Lynda Calkins will present an update on the progress of the Division III strategic plan. The discussion will highlight the key priorities and goals articulated in the plan. It will also incorporate by reference the written reports of our Division III and Association-wide committees.

Although we will not hear directly from the committee chairs like we did last year, the written reports identify issues in the strategic plan that will be the focus of the future work of our committees. We will hear directly from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, however, because we want to ensure that the work of that committee remains a primary focus of our governance structure.

Our second discussion this morning will focus on the Division III Institutional Self-Study Guide, which we will refer to probably more often to as the ISSG, and the related issue of Division III financial aid. This session will include a status report on the review of financial aid as well as the next steps in defining the future of Division III financial aid. That discussion should take us to noon and lunchtime.

After lunch, we will open the window for reconsideration related to the legislation voted on this morning. John Biddiscombe will handle that. Once we close the window of reconsideration, we will conduct three separate discussion forums. I encourage your input during those important sessions.

The first forum this afternoon will be dedicated to the issue of gender and ethnic diversity in Division III. That session should last approximately an hour and 15 minutes. The issue is a top priority throughout the entire Association and affects us at the national, conference and campus levels. Our division has unique issues and challenges related to the issue of diversity, and we will focus on those topics during our discussion. At that time, we will take our afternoon break.

We will begin our second afternoon discussion session at approximately 3 p.m. It will focus on the legislative future of Division III, including deregulation and the simplification of the Division III Manual. The members of our Interpretations and Legislation Committee will coordinate that session.

Our third discussion will focus on the future of amateurism regulations in the Association overall and in particular Division III. The members of our new Amateurism Task Force will lead that session. The amateurism session should start around 4 p.m. and take us to the end of the day. If we have any time left over, we will open the floor for questions. We intend to adjourn this afternoon by 5 o'clock.

We have a full agenda, and we will need to stay on schedule. I encourage you to be prompt when you return from lunch and breaks. I would like to take just a moment and ask individuals who have participated in the governance of Division III to stand. If you participated in any of the committees, in planning the conference, in participating in the planning of yesterday's forum, in any of the forums today, or served directly on the governance staff, please stand.

I will begin by asking members of the Presidents Council to stand. Please remain standing. Members of the Management Council, please join them. Those of you who served in our governance structure or Convention planning or programs in any way, please stand and join them. Any of the committees, Association-wide, Division III. I want to thank all of these individuals for the work they put in, sometimes daily, on our behalf. Would you please join me? (Applause)

Anyone who served on a sport committee or hosted an NCAA championship the past year, would you please stand as well? (Applause) In my early reference to committees, I meant all committees should be included, as well as those who were host of a championship.

There are a few comments I would like to make, then we will

begin with our actual work. Just some personal comments. In my view, the Division III governance structure has really gained some maturity over the years—the few years we have been federated—and is working well. We have extremely good communication between members of the Presidents Council, the Management Council and the committee structure. Members of the Management Council serve on each Division III general committee. Representatives of the Management Council routinely attend Presidents Council meetings. That cross combination has proven very beneficial, especially as we deal with tough issues.

I have been particularly impressed with how committee and Council members approach their governance structure responsibilities. Members consistently attempt to leave their institutional, sport, conference, and regional interests aside, and strive to look at the big picture and what's in the best interest of the division as a whole. This is a real credit to those serving in the structure, and it allows us truly to benefit from the diversity of our membership. This is especially true of the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

Agenda items and initiatives routinely are evaluated in light of the Division III philosophy statement and strategic plan. If a recommendation is not consistent with the plan and our philosophy, it does not progress. Please keep this concept in mind as we discuss our proposed legislation over the next two days. Almost all of the proposals you will consider originated in the committee structure and have been reviewed by numerous committees and the Management Council on the way to sponsorship by the Presidents Council and consideration on the Convention floor.

Of course, this review process does not ensure that the proposals are perfect. But it does mean that the proposals represent the collective hard work and wisdom of many individuals from very diverse backgrounds across the country, many of whom are here today and who serve as committee and Council members. These proposals are an attempt in some way to further the Division III philosophy.

My final comment relates to the role of our division and the governance structure in the Association as a whole. As you heard during the opening business session yesterday, Association-wide issues are dealt with in the Executive Committee. As you also heard yesterday, the Committee continues to define its proper role and function in the new governance structure. My pledge to you is that as chair of the Presidents Council and a member of the Association-wide Executive Committee, I will continue to work to ensure that the voice of our division is heard in the deliberations of that Association-wide body.

We are now prepared to receive the Presidents Council and Management Council reports. Presenting the Presidents Council report will be President Judson Taylor of the State University of New York at Cortland. President Taylor is completing his final year on the Presidents Council. He has served on many Council subcommittees, including our Convention Planning Committee and the Executive

Committee's Subcommittee on Gender and Diversity Issues. He has been a dedicated member of the Council, and we will miss his many valuable contributions.

President Taylor. (Applause)

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT

Judson Taylor (State University of New York at Cortland): Thank you, Ann. I certainly enjoyed the character-building session yesterday. I thought what a test of character it is to come from the frozen tundra of upstate New York to sunny San Diego and a packed agenda at the NCAA meeting.

It is a pleasure to present this report summarizing the work of the Division III Presidents Council during 1999. In the second full year of the federated structure, we directed much more attention to the work and progress of the Management Council on behalf of the committee structure and division. Following the adoption of legislation of last year's Convention to expand the size of the Presidents Council, we welcomed four new members. I would like them to stand: Stanley B. Caine, Adrian College; Daniel DiBiasio, Wilmington College; Muriel Howard, Buffalo State College; Jeanie Watson, Nebraska Wesleyan University. Welcome to the Council.

We began the year with our annual joint meeting with members from the Management Council. The meeting focused on four key areas for Division III: strategic planning, communication, the governance structure, and Association-wide issues. Both Councils recommended continued efforts to promote the principles for which the division is based, including a significant focus on academics. We endorsed efforts to pursue membership education and communication and student-athlete welfare issues. We also endorsed continued educational efforts in the areas of sportsmanship, gambling and alcohol-related issues.

From an Association-wide perspective, the Councils discussed the importance of a Division III voice on the Executive Committee. In that regard, I would like to thank Presidents Ann Die and Tom Courtice for their outstanding voices on behalf of Division III as members of the Executive Committee.

Strategic planning remains a high priority for the Council. Greater details of the plan will be provided later this morning. The Presidents Council commends the work during the past year of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, the Management Council and committee structure toward achieving the objectives identified in our plan. I urge the membership to scan the strategic plan and the committee reports, which were distributed to you this morning, for a better understanding of the work of the governance structure.

Along with strategic planning, the Presidents Council approved the 2000 Convention schedule and discussion forums and focused its attention on three other major issues over the last year. One was a formal evaluation of the new governance structure. While the Man-

agement Council and the committees identified minor structural changes based on the overall evaluation, the new federated structure appears to be working well for Division III.

A second issue was championships. The Council endorsed increases in several individual and team sport field sizes and approved the recommendation to standardize the championships experience for all Division III student-athletes. These initiatives were funded beginning with the 1999-2000 academic year. The Council also continues to monitor the implementation of the automatic qualification process that was adopted by the membership at last year's Convention. It should be noted that over the past three years, the Division III budget has supported over \$2 million in new championships initiatives.

The third issue, legislation and deregulation, is most evident by an increased number of legislative proposals. The Council spent a considerable amount of time addressing key issues, such as Proposal No. 49, to require institutional chief executive officers to have ultimate responsibility and final authority for the operation of Division III member conferences; proposal No. 50, to require each Division III multisport conference to establish a conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committee as a condition and obligation of membership; and Proposal No. 51, issues related to collegiate all-star contests in Division III. If adopted, Division III institutions will have the ultimate authority to determine involvement of institutional personnel, equipment and facilities in all-star contests. Student-athletes with eligibility remaining will be precluded from participation in all-star contests in all sports.

Proposal No. 55 prohibits outside competition during the nontraditional segment. I should add that today we're introducing an amendment that deals separately with golf and tennis. With this proposal, the membership will have the responsibility to act on this issue, which has been discussed for several years. The Council anticipates a spirited debate and hopes for the ultimate adoption of this proposal.

There were other highlights during the past year. We approved the establishment of a Division III Amateurism Task Force to work in concert with Divisions I and II to address amateurism issues for the Association. This group will update the membership on its work later this afternoon. We reviewed the Association's audit report on gender equity and diversity, as recommended by the Executive Committee, and noted the importance of CEO leadership on campuses relative to two key issues—hiring of women and minorities and increasing participation opportunities and sports sponsorship for women's sports. We will discuss this issue of diversity in Division III in more detail this afternoon.

We selected Peter W. Stanley, president of Pomona-Pitzer Colleges, and Robert H. Chambers, president of Western Maryland College, to begin service on the Council at the close of the Convention.

Finally, President Die, it's been my pleasure to serve as a member of the Presidents Council. As I conclude my term, I wish to thank you and Tom Courtice, chair and vice-chair of the Council, for your outstanding leadership on behalf of Division III. I wish you and the rest of my colleagues the best as we begin the new millennium. That concludes my report. Thank you. (Applause)

Ms. Die: Thank you, Jud. I would like to ask those of you here to please show your appreciation to Jud, who is completing his term on the Presidents Council, and also to Gordon Haaland, president of Gettysburg College, as departing members of the Presidents Council. (Applause)

Our next report summarizes the work of the Management Council during the past year. Presenting this report will be Carlyle Carter, executive director of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. Carlyle is completing his term on the Management Council, which has included service on the Interpretations and Legislation Committee and the Walter Byers Scholarship Committee, as well as the Administrative Review Subcommittee and the Committee to Review All-Star Contest Certification.

Carlyle Carter.

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL REPORT

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Thank you, President Die. Before I present the Management Council report, I'd like to make just a few personal comments. First off, it's been a real privilege to serve as a member of the Management Council during the last three years. I'm most grateful to my colleagues on that body for their leadership and hard work during 1999 as well as the two previous years. I'd like to also thank those members of the Administrative Review Subcommittee, Interpretations and Legislation Committee, All-Star Certification, and the Walter Byers Postgraduate Scholarship Committee.

In addition, I'd like to talk about membership involvement in the NCAA. The NCAA is like a democracy. It requires your participation. If you don't participate, if you don't get involved in the committee and governance structure, it might as well be a dictatorship. So you need to get involved.

The next thing I'd like to do is thank the NCAA staff. If you haven't been involved in the committee structure and governance structure, you may not get to see the amount of hours and the amount of work that our staff performs for us. You have to go backstage to see the actors running back and forth going after everything. I would like to applaud our NCAA staff. They take a lot of heat from the media as though they're the ones who pass the legislation. They're the ones who are responsible for making sure that we adhere to the legislation that we pass. You know, we are the NCAA. So when members of the media say, "Those idiots at the NCAA," remember they're talking about you. (Laughter) So you need to respond to those who aren't informed.

I'd like to get into the body of my report. On behalf of the Division III Management Council, I am pleased to provide a report of our work during 1999. It's been a year marked by significant discussion, dialogue and debate on a variety of issues that resulted in legislative proposals that the membership will have an opportunity to vote on in a few minutes. The Management Council would like to thank the members of the Division III committee structure for their work during the past year. The legislative requirement of a Management Council representative serving on all Division III and Association-wide committees continues to be very beneficial. It provides a critical communication link from the committees to the Council.

The Council would also like to express appreciation to the members of the Division III Presidents Council for empowering us to engage in the details of issues and present recommendations that reflect our collective wisdom. If you recall, it wasn't too long ago that the presidents asked us to go back to our philosophy and make sure that our legislation reflects our philosophy. We applaud them on that.

This Convention is the second one that was planned with the assistance of a Convention Planning Committee. The group has grown from eight to 11 individuals and now includes an Executive Committee member from the NAD3AD (National Association of Division III Athletics Directors), a member of FARA, and a representative from the Division III SAAC. The efforts and work of this group are evident as we review our schedule and engage each other over the next day-and-a-half. Our thanks to the members of this committee. I'd like to recognize them: John Biddiscombe, director of athletics, Wesleyan University, chair of the Division III Management Council; Kaitlyn Chmielinski, a student-athlete from Sweet Briar College representing SAAC; Tom Courtice, president, Ohio Wesleyan University, representing the Presidents Council; Linda Hopple, executive director, Middle Atlantic States Athletic Conference; Leon Lunder, director of athletics, Carleton College, representing the NAD3AD; Bob Malekoff, director of athletics, College of Wooster; Oscar Page, president, Austin College, representing the Management Council; Joy Reign, director of athletics at Rowan University, representing the Management Council and serving as the chair; Marilyn Skrivseth, director of athletics, University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; Judson Taylor, president, State University of New York at Cortland, representing the Presidents Council; and Christopher Walker, faculty athletics representative, University of Redlands.

This group, along with the Management and Presidents Council, will again be anxious to receive our comments in our post-Convention questionnaire, so please take the time to fill that out and turn it in.

The Division III strategic plan continues to provide guidance and direction to the work of the Council and committee structure. Later this morning, you will hear great detail related to the plan. We encourage each delegate to review the plan, which continues to serve as

a blueprint for the work of the structure. Your comments and feedback regarding the details of the plan are always appreciated.

General Management Council business included the updating of a Division III fact sheet and talking points and the distribution to the membership of a Division III newsletter on a quarterly basis. These two initiatives serve to promote Division III and to enhance the overall level and quality of communication to a variety of membership constituencies throughout the year.

The Council and the committee structure engaged in a formal evaluation of the new governance structure. The committee structure identified several minor structural changes, which were addressed through noncontroversial legislation contained in Appendix D, your blue pages of the 2000 Official Convention Notice.

A few key recommendations were: To increase Division III student-athlete representation on several Association-wide committees; a student-athlete from Divisions I and II will also be added; and the Division III Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee would specify that if an interim vacancy occurs and if any member has equal to more than one-half of a term remaining, then that committee member may be replaced on that committee by another representative of the same conference or institution for the remainder of that term—I know you all understood that; and to separate the Committee on Infractions and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement into two distinct committees since they work independently.

Overall, the review indicated a good and effective working relationship between the Management and Presidents Councils and the Division III committee structure. We spent a significant amount of time reviewing the work and recommendations from Division III and Association-wide committees. We applaud the committees for their efforts during the past year. Detail of the work of all Division III and Association-wide committees is contained in the written reports, which each delegate received this morning.

We also spent a considerable amount of time on issues related to membership, financial aid, deregulation and championships. Much of the work of these committees is reflected in the 46 legislative proposals, including four submitted by the Division III membership to be voted on later this morning. It is evident that federation has resulted in more discussions and issues specific to Division III. We view this as a positive development.

The Council addressed a few key Association-wide issues. As a result of the gender equity and diversity audit, we discussed several recommendations to increase opportunities for women and minorities. In response to the recommendation, the Council agreed to sponsor a discussion session on gender and diversity issues in Division III. That discussion will occur later today.

We also recommended the sponsorship of legislative Proposals No. 56, 57 and 58 to increase NCAA championship opportunities for women. The Management Council Subcommittee to Address All-Star

Contests in Division III recommended a series of legislative modifications following its report of findings and membership input. The Council recommended that the Presidents Council sponsor Proposal No. 51 to address the issue. The proposal addresses three issues related to collegiate all-star contests in Division III.

First, it treats student-athletes consistently by precluding participation in all-star events in all sports until eligibility is exhausted. Currently, the prohibition only applies to football and men's basketball athletes. Second, it deletes all Manual references to the all-star contest certification process. And third, it permits involvement by institutional staff members and permits the use of institutional facilities in all-star contests.

We approved increased access and funding for individual and team sports in men's and women's cross country, men's and women's tennis, and men's and women's swimming. Funding began with this past fall's competition.

The Council also approved a recommendation from the Championships Committee to standardize the championships experience by providing funding for mementos, hospitality activities and officials' and volunteer apparel for all Division III championship finalists beginning with the fall '99 championships.

The Council has also charged the committee to engage in a comprehensive review of the championships experience, including the site selection and preliminary bid process. The Council expects a report on this topic in April of 2000.

The Interpretations and Legislation Committee, at the direction of the Council, spent the past year continuing its work on deregulation. Proposals 59 through 79 are a result of their comprehensive efforts and will be presented as a package. The committee will present more specific information and detail regarding its work this afternoon. A membership vote on the deregulation package will occur tomorrow morning.

The Membership, Financial Aid, and Interpretations and Legislation Committees jointly sponsored the first Division III educational videoconference December 3. Educational initiatives for the membership remain a high priority. The Council and committee structure remain open to suggestions for the best means of disseminating educational information to the membership.

The Membership Committee recommended, and the Council approved, active membership status for six institutions and four new provisional members that began their four-year educational programming. Issues regarding Division III financial aid legislation and the awards process continue to dominate the work of the committee and the Council. You will hear a status report regarding the Institutional Self-Study Guide, and financial aid requirements will be discussed later this morning.

Another legislative proposal that clearly merits your consideration during Division III voting is Proposal No. 55, which precludes

competition in the nontraditional segment. The proposal is a result of considerable Council discussion, member input and compromise. The proposal represents a philosophical position that competition beyond the traditional segment undermines the academic mission of Division III institutions and that such competition is unnecessary. It also fulfills a commitment to provide a clear legislative choice to the membership. The Council hopes that the debate regarding the application of the proposal to golf and tennis does not distract from the overall intent and purpose of the legislation that we heard in the Presidents Council report. You also have on your tables issues or information regarding golf and tennis.

In October, the Council welcomed Susan Bassett, director of athletics, William Smith College, to fill an immediate vacancy.

The Management Council wishes to thank three key individuals whose terms of service will conclude at the close of the Convention. The first is Kerry Gotham, student-athlete from Nazareth College who is completing his two-year term on the Council as a representative of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Kerry has served on the Strategic Planning Committee and continues to serve on the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. I also believe Kerry has served as the chair of the NCAA SAAC. Kerry, would you stand? (Applause)

We would also like to thank Lynda Calkins, director of athletics at Hollins University, as vice-chair of the Council. Lynda serves on numerous committees and subcommittees and notably, her service on the Budget Committee and Division III Strategic Planning Committee were invaluable. Lynda Calkins. (Applause)

Lastly, I'd personally like to thank John Biddiscombe, director of athletics at Wesleyan University, who served the past two years as chair of the Council. His time, commitment, dedication and tireless energy to our commission have been remarkable. We are sure that you have made many personal and professional sacrifices to assist the division. We want you to know that they were and are appreciated. You left your mark of leadership, philosophical beliefs and appreciation of strategic planning on all of us, and for that we are grateful. John Biddiscombe. (Applause) Each of these individuals has served the division in the highest professional manner. Finally, the Council elected Walter Johnson, director of athletics at North Central College, to serve as chair, and Joy Reighn, director of athletics at Rowan University, as vice-chair for the upcoming year. Walter and Joy, would you stand? (Applause)

As you can tell, the Management Council and Division III committees have had a busy year working on the goals and priorities for Division III. We are happy with our progress and, as always, challenged by what lies ahead.

Lastly, I would like to thank the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference for giving me the opportunity and providing me with

the support to be able to serve the Association. I'd be happy to entertain any questions you may have at this time.

If there are no questions, that concludes my report. It's been a pleasure to serve the Management Council and I truly thank you. (Applause)

Ms. Die: Thank you, Carlyle, for that thorough report. I think members of the audience get a sense of how many hours members of the Management Council put in on our behalf. Everything he said about John Biddiscombe is absolutely true. John, we do appreciate your work.

I should note, as Carlyle did, that Carlyle is one of four individuals who will be completing their terms of service on the Management Council. I'll ask you one more time to acknowledge them. Along with Carlyle is Management Council Chair Biddiscombe, Vice-Chair Lynda Calkins, and one of our student-athletes, Kerry Gotham from Nazareth College. Each of these individuals, as Carlyle said, has made significant contributions to the work of the Management Council and to the entire governance of our division during a most critical transition period. They have done so much to bring our governance structure to greater and greater maturity. Please join me one more time in expressing our gratitude for their dedication. (Applause)

We are now ready to consider our 10 roll-call legislative proposals identified earlier. I would like John to read us through that process. John.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thank you, President Die, and good morning everyone. This morning we will consider nine legislative proposals. These are Proposals No. 49 through 58 in your Convention Notice. We will also consider one related amendment-to-amendment. Since there was not a motion to reorder, we will vote on those proposals in numerical order as listed in Appendix A of your Convention Notice. Also, please remember the editorial corrections found on pages 4 through 6 of the Convention Program. Please note that Proposal No. 54 has been withdrawn by the sponsors.

Proposal Nos. 49 through 58 make up the Presidents Council grouping, and we will conduct a roll call electronic vote on those proposals. Please remember also that any motion related to those proposals and related amendments-to-amendments must also be determined by electronic roll-call vote. You will need both your voting paddle and your electronic voting unit for any vote during this business session.

Our voting procedures dictate that all voting be done by paddle or electronic rather than by voice or by hand. Because we intend to use the wireless voting units today, I would like to make a few points about this system. We will use the same voting system as employed at the 1999 Convention.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained.]

We are now ready to begin our voting with consideration of Proposal 49. I would like to remind you to please state your name and institution for our records when you are recognized by the chair at one of the numbered microphones. We will now consider Proposal 49.

Conditions and Obligations of Conference Membership—Chief Executive Officer Authority

Lee Pelton (Willamette University): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 49.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will obligate institutional chief executive officers to have ultimate responsibility and final authority for the operation of Division III member conferences. The proposal is consistent with and parallel to the greater leadership role that CEOs have assumed in the NCAA's new governance structure. Delegates should know that the level of CEO involvement is not legislated. Such involvement may be determined by each conference, providing institutional CEOs are the final authority. Currently, such responsibility and authority is not required.

This proposal mirrors the chief-executive-officers-are-in-control legislation currently found in Constitution 6.1.1, applicable to member institutions. It is envisioned that the Division III Membership Committee will review member conferences' bylaws to ensure that this requirement is being satisfied.

For these reasons, I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 49 (Page A-54) was adopted, effective August 1, 2001.]

Conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committees

Kerry Gotham (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): As a member of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and the Division III Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 50.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will help to ensure that Division III campus Student-Athlete Advisory Committees that are affiliated with multi-sport, voting conferences gain a voice at the conference level. With the formation of conference SAACs, student-athletes will be afforded a greater role at the conference level in issues dealing with increased opportunities, student-athlete welfare and conference rules and regulations.

This proposal has an effective date of August 1, 2001, so that conferences have sufficient time to comply. The composition and duties of the conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committees will be determined by each individual conference.

The adoption of this proposal will help to increase the level of student-athlete participation at the conference level. The Division III

Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly urges you to support this proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-55) was adopted, 185-69-3, effective August 1, 2000.]

All-Star Contests

Al Bean (University of Southern Maine): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 51.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will provide Division III schools with the ultimate authority to determine to what extent institutional personnel, equipment and facilities are involved in all-star contests. It also removes some obsolete language from the Manual that describes an all-star contest's certification process that was not in existence when the new governance structure was implemented.

Finally, the proposal will clarify that student-athletes in all sports, not just football and men's basketball, do not participate in all-star contests until their eligibility has expired. This proposal is the result of a 1½-year review of all-star contest issues by a Management Council subcommittee. The review process included an informal survey as well as significant input from the membership. This legislation is consistent with the spirit of deregulation, and I urge your support. Thank you.

Stanley Caine (Adrian College): I urge the delegates to support this proposal for the reasons that have already been cited. I do want to emphasize one point, however. If this proposal is adopted, each institution should be sure to review its policies and procedures regarding involvement of personnel, facilities and equipment in all-star contests.

These discussions should also include a thorough review of your liability coverage with your insurance carrier. Many members have assumed that the NCAA catastrophic injury insurance program covers injuries in an all-star contest. We have talked with the NCAA insurance carrier and this is not the case. Institutions and conferences are and have been on their own related to these contests from a liability standpoint.

This is good legislation that clarifies how all-star contests are truly administered. It leaves participation decisions clearly with institutions and conferences where they belong. I do urge all of you to be sure to develop appropriate policies and procedures and address relevant liability issues on campus and with your conference to be sure that the implementation of this proposal is a success. Thank you.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I have a question. In reading this, we want to make sure that it is clear that the eligibility is in that sport, is it not? The remaining eligibility in that particular sport...

Mr. Biddiscombe: I am advised that in fact that is the interpretation, yes.

Randi Borgen (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports the adoption of Proposal No. 51. We believe that allowing institutional staff members to be involved in the development and operation of all-star contests will aid in creating a positive and philosophically appropriate environment for student-athletes.

In the past, there have been occurrences of misrepresentation among all-star contests that have left the student-athlete unfulfilled. By permitting institutional facilities to be used in these contests, with the understanding that the institution assumes all inherent risks involved, the positive experience for the student-athlete will be further enhanced.

In accordance with the Division III philosophy, we note that all-star contests encourage variety and create opportunities for the student-athlete with no eligibility left. The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to adopt this proposal.

[Proposal No. 50 (Page A-55) was adopted, 185-69-3, effective August 1, 2001.]

Season of Competition—Minimum Amount of Competition

Muriel Moore (State University of New York at Geneseo): On behalf of the State University of New York Athletic Conference, I move Proposal 52.

[The motion was seconded.]

In the selection process that occurs at many Division III institutions, student-athletes are frequently allowed to practice for an extended period of time. Scrimmages are often scheduled to allow the opportunity to try various combinations of players. Under the current legislation, a student-athlete would use a season of eligibility if they appeared in a scrimmage for as little as five seconds. It does not seem fair to the student-athlete to count this abrupt trial as a season of eligibility. The reasons for student-athletes not participating beyond this point are too numerous to mention. Most are very legitimate reasons. The bottom line is to provide opportunity for students who want to compete to be able to compete.

John Galgano (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee supports the adoption of Proposal No. 52.

We support this proposal for the following three reasons: First, scrimmages are often used as a method for tryouts; second, inasmuch as scrimmages are currently counted as seasons of competition, student-athletes may be discouraged from participating; third, scrimmages are taken into account for determining hardship waivers.

With respect to the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee mission statement, student-athletes' participation in athletics needs to be encouraged. With the adoption of this proposal, a student-athlete will be encouraged to participate and/or try out without the fear of losing one whole season of competition.

The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to adopt this proposal. Thank you.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): Just a question for clarification. How would Proposal 52 affect the hardship situation? Currently, scrimmages are treated just as regular contests. For example, if somebody were to get hurt in a scrimmage and not play again, would there be a need for a hardship request and not utilize a season of competition?

Mr. Biddiscombe: We'll check and get an interpretation for you.

Mr. Gleason: Currently, if you look at the legislation, it would be a scrimmage. If you play in a scrimmage, you do need to file a hardship, but would that still be the case after this?

Lynn Holzman (NCAA Staff): I'm a coordinator of legislation in membership services. As you correctly stated, in the current application of the hardship waiver, scrimmages are included in that factor. With this legislation, if it were to be adopted, participation in scrimmage would not trigger or constitute a season of competition. So therefore, a hardship waiver would not need to be filed because a student-athlete would not use a season of competition. The current legislation that appears in a hardship waiver, including such scrimmages, would still exist. This legislation does not amend that.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): I want to follow up on the question. There are sports, for example, basketball, where you have scrimmages all the way up to the championship. So the issue isn't scrimmages; the issue is whether they're in the regular season or not in the regular season. For scrimmages that occur within the regular season, will they still remain in the formula? How does this apply if 55 passes as amended?

Mr. Biddiscombe: We're going to have to take a moment to get an interpretation. We have two different questions here that are being considered.

Ms. Holzman: In addressing the one aspect of the question specifically, I'm going to try to reiterate this. The way the proposal is written, only scrimmages that are conducted in the preseason, if a student-athlete participates in those, the participation would not trigger per se using a season of competition. If a scrimmage is conducted during the regular season or the postseason, and that's the only competition that the student-athlete participates in, that student-athlete would still be charged with a season of competition.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Before we vote on 52, it might be helpful if the chair could remind the delegates that there is a procedure for filing an official interpretation. There's actually a form in the Notice that allows you to do that. Secondly, if we could hold those questions for interpretations that only are going to impact the delegates voting on that proposal to that time and discussion, that would be helpful.

Otherwise, I think our voting is going to get held up here. I certainly don't want to close off discussion and debate, but we need to re-

ally focus on the merits of our proposals for each of our discussions. If there are no other comments on 52 and we're ready to vote, please take your voting machines and cast your votes.

[Proposal No. 52 (Page A-58) was adopted, 193-32-4.]

Two-Year College Transfers—Two-Year Nonparticipation Exception

Muriel Howard (State University College at Buffalo): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 53.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal would permit students transferring from two- and four-year colleges the same two-year nonparticipation exception. Equal opportunity and treatment of student-athletes is consistent with the Division III philosophy. It is important to remember the fact that Division III institutions must still determine the athletics eligibility of a two-year college student who uses this transfer exception. This leaves academic eligibility decisions at the campus and conference level, which is appropriate. This proposal would be effective immediately if adopted.

Truman Turnquist (Mount Union College): As a member of the Division III Management Council Subcommittee on Academic Issues, I urge you to adopt Proposal No. 53. This proposal will permit students who attend a two-year college the same two-year nonparticipation transfer exception that currently is available to four-year college transfers. The adoption of this proposal will allow two-year college transfer students to become immediately eligible at Division III institutions, provided they have neither practiced nor competed in their sport for a consecutive two-year period nor done so in organized, non-collegiate amateur competition.

The subcommittee is in favor of this proposal, and we urge you to support its adoption.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you. Are there other comments about this proposal? If not, I do want to note that our bylaws require a separate vote on an immediate effective date as it was moved. This requires a two-thirds vote required for approval. However, I do want to note that with the adoption of Proposal No. 2 in the appendix of the Convention Official Notice, this is the last year we will conduct such a separate vote. The Presidents Council has agreed that we can determine the effective date with the use of a paddle vote. If the effective date is defeated and the proposal is adopted, then August 1 will automatically become the effective date.

[Proposal No. 53 (Page A-59) was adopted, 239-3-1, effective immediately.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Competition in Nontraditional Segment

Stanley Caine (Adrian College): On behalf of the Presidents

Council and the Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 55.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will eliminate competition in the nontraditional playing segment, the portion of the playing season that does not conclude with the NCAA championship in that sport. As a division, we have thoroughly reviewed and discussed the nontraditional playing season over the last few years. At the Convention last year, the discussion session concluded with a series of straw votes. These votes clearly supported a modification of the current nontraditional segment legislation. They also indicated that the membership as a whole does not favor the total elimination of the nontraditional segment.

The Management Council formed a subcommittee to explore possible modifications. The subcommittee conducted a series of surveys that showed a clear desire to retain the instructional and team-building benefits of practice sessions during the nontraditional season. The proposal retains these important practice opportunities.

Eliminating competition in the nontraditional season will address a series of problems. These problems include excessive demands on limited institutional resources, facilities and personnel, both coaches and trainers. Perhaps more importantly, the proposal will help to reduce academic and competition pressures on our student-athletes by returning the nontraditional segment to a more proper context.

This proposal is fully consistent with the mission and principles of Division III. We have recognized a need to provide those with special interests and expertise in tennis and golf with the opportunity to enter into a dialogue concerning some of the distinctive issues about which they are concerned. Their interests will be accommodated in an amendment that will shortly be proposed by President Page.

We have studied and discussed this issue carefully. It is time to decide. On behalf of the Presidents Council and the Management Council, I encourage your support for this proposal. Thank you.

Oscar Page (Austin College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 55-1.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment-to-amendment would delay by one year, until August 1, 2001, the effective date of Proposal No. 55 in the sports of tennis and golf. There are three main reasons the Councils support this amendment.

First, the delay will allow the members of the tennis and golf communities additional time to become better educated about the intent and ultimate effect of Proposal No. 55 in those sports. As many of you know, there has been much confusion over how Proposal No. 55 would affect golf and tennis. Many apparently believe incorrectly that those sports were exempt from the original proposal. However,

the language of the proposal actually exempts only those programs that played more than 50 percent of their contests in the fall nontraditional segment. While this was the intent of the original proposal, it was not well understood.

Second, the one-year delay will permit programs to avoid conflicts with various matches already under contract for the fall of 2000. We understand that this may be a common problem.

Third, the delay will provide additional time for the governance structure and the membership to consider legislative options that might address the concerns expressed by the tennis and golf communities while retaining the philosophical basis of Proposal 55. If Proposal 55 was adopted, the governance structure leadership will explore various legislative alternatives related to golf and tennis. If an acceptable approach is identified, the Management and Presidents Councils can sponsor the legislation for a membership vote next January.

If a suitable compromise does not emerge by next spring, ample time would remain for the membership to sponsor legislation presenting a full range of alternatives at the 2001 Convention. Either way, the membership would have an additional opportunity to consider legislation on this issue at the 2001 Convention, prior to the new implementation date for golf and tennis in August 2001.

This process will need time to bear fruit. The amendment-to-the-amendment will provide us with that valuable time. I encourage you to vote yes on Proposal No. 55-1. Thank you very much.

Ann Robideaux (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): I'm a member of the board of directors of the Intercollegiate Tennis Association and represent many Division III tennis coaches. We urge your support for adoption of 55-1 for two specific reasons.

The wording of No. 55, "to prohibit Division III institutions from competing against outside competition during the nontraditional segment, except in the sports of golf and tennis per Bylaw 17.1.1.4," is very confusing and has led to much misunderstanding among tennis coaches, administrators and others with an interest in the interpretation of No. 55. In fact, as coaches, we believe tennis and golf to be exempt as singled out by the wording of No. 55. We did not rally our forces until early December, much too late to initiate amendments through normal NCAA channels.

Secondly, Proposal 55 would eliminate for most tennis programs an opportunity to participate in the fall ITA regional championships and qualify for the pinnacle of all ITA play, which is small college championships. The ITA has developed these regional events and small college championships over the past 15 to 20 years and is bound by legal contract to sites and host institutions for the 2000-2001 season.

We urge your support and passage of this amendment, 55-1, which provides a time for discussion and dialogue to better understand why tennis and golf do stand apart from other sports. Give us the time that we think tennis and golf deserve. Thank you.

Scott Carnahan (Linfield College): I'm a representative of the Division III Baseball Coaches Association, which voted unanimously against Proposal 55 during our business meeting in Chicago last week. Even though many of our institutions and conferences currently do not play outside competition during the nontraditional segment, the Baseball Coaches Association agreed that any regulation regarding initial competition should be continued as is or be determined at the institutional level or the conference level.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you. I would hope that the speakers would direct their comments toward the amendment, which is on golf and tennis. Thank you.

Bette Landman (Beaver College): I would like to emphasize two points. First, if this proposal is adopted, the Presidents Council will consider all legislative options that it receives regarding golf and tennis. We will charge the Management Council to work with the leadership of the golf and tennis communities to identify these legislative alternatives, and no options will be off the table.

Second, the Presidents Council will assure that the governance structure considers legislative options in a timely manner. We will charge the Management Council with forwarding a preliminary report to us by April. This will permit plenty of time to notify the membership regarding the evolution of this issue prior to the July deadline for submission of proposed legislation.

The Presidents Council believes there are reasonable accommodations similar to those that the Council promised and delivered with the automatic qualifier legislation that was adopted last year. On behalf of the Presidents Council, I encourage you to adopt Proposal No. 55-1.

Patty Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): I'm the chair of the Division III Tennis Committee. I urge you and encourage you to vote for the adoption of the amendment to Proposition 55. First of all, I want to thank the ITA for the amount of work they put into organizing the publication of an interpretation out to the colleges. I also want to thank the Presidents Council for giving us this opportunity as proposed by amendment to No. 55.

There are two reasons why I think this is an important amendment. First of all, as an athletic administrator, I find myself in a practical versus philosophical quagmire when thinking of implementing this proposal for golf and tennis. If, for instance, I have two teams that both play a nontraditional schedule in the fall—and from now on, I'm going to call the nontraditional segment "the fall"—and they play their championships season in the spring, I then have a problem because of the extra access that we have afforded to the Division III tennis schools.

It's also my obligation as an athletic director to make it possible for them to benefit from the additional access that is going to begin this year in Division III tennis. I therefore must improve my spring season, which will be a tremendous problem between my tennis coach

and my track coach—both of whom use the same facility. It will also make it difficult for me to rationalize the tennis team's help in paying for their spring trip because this is now one of the very, very important factors of our season. Therefore, we play, as many of the schools I know do, 12 matches in six weeks. That cannot be changed. We cannot play any more matches and the league championship within that time, and therefore we would have to increase our spring season.

If, on the other hand, I chose as an administrator to let both my men and women play their championship season in the fall, then encourage them to get involved in the championships, I would also have to have a spring season. The fall season would be a full-blown 10-week season with the obligation to get back before the classes started and also with the expenses that that would also entail. In some cases in Division III, a soccer coach coaches the tennis team in the spring. That would give me staffing problems.

If, on the other hand, an athletic director has a situation where either the men's or women's team plays in the fall and the men's or women's team plays in the spring, there is then an equity problem. The team that plays in the fall indeed has the opportunity to also play in the spring under the legislation as it's written. On the other hand, the team that plays in the spring cannot play in the fall in any type of organized competition. This is going to cause once again tremendous problems. It's going to cause facility problems. It's going to cause economic problems.

I urge you and encourage you to please follow the Presidents Council and have an amendment to Proposition 55 so that we can have the time and do the homework that needs to be done to make this a philosophically and practically applicable proposal.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I'm the chair of the Division III Men's Golf Committee. I'd like to address someone from the Presidents Council to answer a question. Patty Epps wrote perhaps the best written response I've seen in 20 years to the proposed piece of legislation, which offered ways to exempt golf and tennis by replacing the words for Bylaw 17. That option was ignored. Instead, we're being asked to do what we've been asked to do numerous times in this body—pass a bad piece of legislation and hope someone will come along with a solution we can all agree upon. If no one comes with that solution that we can all agree upon, we're left with an effective date and a bad piece of legislation on the books.

I'm concerned that the Presidents Council, when presented with an option, would not choose to exclude golf and tennis and reverse the process. If someone could come up with a good piece of legislation for us to consider, it could then go positively beyond this negative change. Right now, we're being asked to vote on a bad piece of legislation and hope that change will happen. I think for some of us, the reference to the championships issue was not a positive one. Some of

us still feel bad about being told what was going to come forward and didn't come forward. So I caution you that the process in this situation has been reversed. We should not pass bad legislation intentionally and hope that we can alter it.

So if someone from the Presidents Council could tell me why they didn't just choose to just exempt golf and tennis and then address it correctly later, rather than this process being flip-flopped, I'd like to listen to that response.

Bette Landman (Beaver College): I simply want to urge again that all items will be on the table when we reexamine this issue over the year of delay. I think we want to understand the complexities of the issue. You had a chance here to make your case. I also believe that as we've indicated, if we do this in a timely way and we come up with a recommendation that is incompatible with where people want to be, they always have the opportunity to propose alternative legislation.

Tim Brown (Skidmore College): I'm president of the Golf Coaches Association of America. I rise to urge you to beat this amendment. I have similar comments that Chuck Gordon just made, and I will not repeat. But if the presidents recognize that golf and tennis, the intention was to exempt them, why wasn't the exemption right away? I will hold off on my comments that relate to the defeat of 55 but simply urge you to defeat the amendment because I think that gives us more support to defeat Proposition 55.

Linda Moulton (Clark University): I'm concerned that the strategy of the last two speakers is, in fact, to defeat Proposal 55. There are some of us who are in favor of at least some attempt to limit the nontraditional seasons, even if it is competition. I urge you to, in fact, support the amendment so we can have a good discussion about Proposal 55.

Patty Epps (Franklin & Marshall College): I want to echo her sentiments. Also, from a tennis and golf situation, I think that we are a little concerned with the idea of defeating the amendment in the interest of defeating Proposition 55. I think that's a big gamble to take. I urge you once again to vote for the amendment and then we'll deal with the process for 55 without the inclusion of golf and tennis.

Mr. Biddiscombe: I see no other speakers. The chair reminds you this is a roll-call vote.

[Proposal No. 55-1 was adopted, 237-46-3.]

We're now ready to discuss the merits of Prop 55. Speakers please come forward.

Jim Nelson (Suffolk University): John, much to your disappointment, I do not come before you to speak on the restoration of the men's and women's basketball tournament. (Laughter and applause)

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you, Jim.

Mr. Nelson: I have come before this party in the past to introduce various personalities. I have been queried as to who I will be this year. Word of my alter egos has filtered back to my wife, Joan,

and she was not pleased. She has informed me that there is to be no more of this "Don" talk; that when I do introduce myself, that I give my proper title, which to her, I am Mr. Joan Nelson—and don't you forget it. Whatever.

The issue of nontraditional seasons has indeed challenged administrators on campuses across the country. It has stretched further and further into areas of facilities, personnel, financial commitment and student-athlete time demands. All of these areas provide valid reasons to now make a concerned reference as to its necessity and importance at our institutions. There is a necessity for our control, but I do not believe this legislation completely answers all questions. The elimination of game competition is a central theme, and even the rationale of that is flawed in many eyes. In this legislation, practice opportunities still remain unencumbered. With the elimination of competition, practice may now be perceived as even more vital and time-consuming.

I would offer a two-plus-one scenario that provides for two week-day practice opportunities, either coaches or captains, and one weekend competition over a four-week or less time frame. Such a schedule provides support and control to our coaches and student-athletes. There are too many negatives in allowing for institutional-only decision-making for practice opportunities; thus, I would defeat Proposition 55 and modify it for the 2001 Convention to address both practice and competition in the nontraditional season.

Megan Stevens (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee opposes the adoption of Proposal No. 55. The Division III Student-Athlete Committee believes strongly in upholding the Division III philosophy statement. This philosophy statement reads: "Division III institutions are to encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletic opportunities for their students and support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletic performances by providing all teams with appropriate competitive opportunities."

We feel the proposed legislation is in opposition to this philosophy because it reduces, rather than maximizes, the number of athletic opportunities for student-athletes. Furthermore, the opportunities available for the nontraditional season competition include the development of leadership qualities, team unity and the enhancement of the entire educational experience of student-athletes.

The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee urges you to defeat this proposal. (Applause)

Chris Walker (University of Redlands): I'm a member of the Management Council. I want to emphasize that the Division III Faculty Athletics Association strongly supports this proposal. Competition encourages more frequent and more intense practice and other associated team-related activities. This leads to a greater potential for academic conflicts. Eliminating competition in a nontraditional segment will help keep these potential conflicts to a minimum. It will

decrease the intensity of the nontraditional segment and provide students more time for academic and other nonacademic pursuit. This proposal serves the long-term interests of our student-athletes and our division. I encourage you to support it.

(Applause)

Peter Luguri (Plattsburgh State University of New York): As a representative of an institution that is meteorologically challenged—for those of you who might not know the Northeast as well, we are about 50 miles from Montreal, Canada, or Lake Placid, New York, host of the Winter games, not the Summer games. I stand before you representing the coaches on my campus and the student-athletes on my campus, similar to the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee for Division III, to say that I am opposed to the elimination of the nontraditional season competition.

Institutions all across the country have the same limitations with regards to facilities, staff and finances that we all live with on a daily basis. Those of us in the more northern climate also have weather to deal with. Many times our most favorable weather is in what would be the nontraditional segment, particularly for spring sports. To eliminate limited competition from our schedules would be an undue hardship for our student-athletes. Our spring is packed already, and trying to squeeze all those contests into less time would be a great hardship.

Many of our campuses have individually approached this issue. For instance, on my campus, we limit it right now to three sessions per week, eight hours total, and no overnight travel or no missed class time in regard to competition in the nontraditional segment. Once again, I'm sure we all track the academic data on our student-athletes very carefully. I think it will come as no surprise to you, it is on our campus and I would suggest that probably it is on yours, that our athletes do better academically, and the traditional segment athlete is much more demanding in terms of time away from the campus.

Last year, I was one of many in this room, like many of you, who raised our hands and said that some modification was necessary. However, removing competition was not what I personally feel and I think many of us feel that it's not what we were asking for. I would urge you to vote against this. (Applause)

John DiBiaggio (Tufts University): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. I rise to support Proposal 55 as amended. I do so because in the past few years the nontraditional segment has taken on greater and greater emphasis at many of our member schools and conferences. Yet, the Division III philosophy statement clearly says that our primary interest should be on regular, in-season competition. This proposal will help Division III return, I believe, to that most important philosophical statement. It is true that the philosophy statement talks about maximizing competitive opportunities for our student-athletes, as you've heard. However, one should not read

that concept out of context. Those competitive opportunities must occur in a proper time frame, otherwise year-round competition could be the logical result.

Competition in the nontraditional segment is not necessary and undermines a proper balance, I believe, of academics and athletics that is the heart of our division's philosophy. By returning the nontraditional segment to a more appropriate instructional focus, this proposal would help restore that proper balance. Thank you. (Applause)

Tim Brown (Skidmore College): I'm president of the Golf Coaches Association of America. Although Amendment 55-1 passed, I still rise to urge your defeat of Proposal 55. There are no guarantees with the amendment or the delayed game. I rise to mention that a year ago, I recall no discussion about the nontraditional segments in individual sports. They were all team-sport-oriented discussions. The survey was the same. You did not relate it to individual sports.

The second point is that there are very few schools in this room that have our own golf courses, so the impact on facilities is minimal, if any, at all. Our golf teams are off campus practicing. The impact on the training room and equipment room, again, little, if any.

I would also mention that the nontraditional segment in baseball, lacrosse, soccer, and so on, contests do not count. In golf, the nontraditional segment contests do count and they have to go to selections to participate in the national championship.

Fourth, there are few athletes at our institution in golf who are two-sport athletes.

Next, I would like to mention the effect on traditional tournaments that have been built up over the years that this will have in golf. The Florida tournament used to be played in March. There were teams participating in that tournament down in Myrtle Beach from Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, New York, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Iowa and Pennsylvania that would now be marched right out of the gym and not be able to participate.

It took us years to get it moved to the middle of October. Not only are the schools from these states competitive, one of these schools actually won that event a few years ago. The Rolex national championship that occurs in October, when the concept was conceived, the original date was to be at the end of March. Those of us in the Northeast and Midwest lobbied against it, moved it to the end of October, and used the same rationale on the Florida tournament.

The last point on the tournaments is the ECAC tournament, which has been going for 40 years, a Division I, II, and III tournament. It's in the beginning of October. It will then become a Division I and II tournament; Division III will not be able to participate in that tournament.

Those three tournaments that I just mentioned are national level, very large tournaments, great tournaments. Schools that participate in all three of those tournaments this year missed 2½ days

or three days of school. The people who run these tournaments make sure they make every effort for the students to stay in the class and they come from a Division III philosophy.

I urge your defeat of Proposition 55. Thank you.

Cela Ocegüera (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The rationale of this proposed legislation states that competition beyond the tradition segment undermines the academic mission of the Division III institutions. However, research has shown that students involved in any campus-affiliated activities are more engaged learners and may perform better in the classroom. I can speak to you from personal experience and would offer that my grades improved while in season.

Institutional control was a key component in the rationale presented by the Management and Presidents Councils regarding Proposal No. 51. Much like Proposal 51, it is our belief that Proposal No. 55 is a matter of institutional control. As such, the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee suggests that we apply this similar rationale regarding Proposal No. 55.

Quite simply, by maintaining the status quo, institutions that compete during the nontraditional seasons will continue to do so. Those that wish not to can make an institutional decision not to, thus maintaining institutional control.

Our most compelling point is a question raised by many student-athletes: Have administrators taken the time to ask any of the student-athletes what they want, or have administrators assumed what's best for the student-athletes?

Our committee, which is made up of 24 student-athletes, echoes the sentiments of the nearly 127,000 student-athletes across the nation. Through our dialogue with campus committees and through discussions with student-athletes at the 1999 NCAA Foundation Leadership Conference, we have repeatedly heard that the competition aspect of nontraditional seasons is imperative to the overall educational experience of the student-athlete.

A cornerstone of Division III athletics is listening to the student-athletes who participate in them. That being said, Division III student-athletes believe that competition is an integral part of the overall student-athlete experience.

The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly urges you to defeat this proposal. Thank you. (Applause)

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I rise to encourage you to defeat 55. Many of my peers have talked to me the past few days about this particular proposal. Having come from two separate leagues that have no nontraditional season, they say wouldn't it be wonderful to level the playing field? I just rise to say there will always be places that have more sun, better facilities and maybe more money in that particular budget. We will never totally level the playing field. I urge you to return it to institutional control and let the administrators on that campus make that decision.

Walter Johnson (North Central College): I'm a member of the Management Council. It's important to remember that this proposal represents a compromise. The membership came to us and said we have issues here, we'd like to have this solved. It came to the Management Council and the presidents. This proposal represents the best thinking of the input of the membership and Management Council and the presidents. It's a compromise between those who favor competition in the nontraditional season and those within the Association who choose to eliminate the nontraditional season altogether.

Many schools, institutions and conferences did not conduct the nontraditional segment and they favor the elimination of the segment across the board. Other schools and conferences conduct a significant nontraditional segment, including a substantial amount of competition with outside entities. Finally, others conduct a very loose and flexible nontraditional segment that is not based on preparation for competition but education and performance enhancement. By eliminating competition in the nontraditional segment but maintaining practice opportunities, the proposal attempts to find a reasonable middle ground between those two approaches.

Compromise is never perfect. I think you could say the same about this particular proposal as well. It is sound legislation. It is sound legislation. Again, it takes into consideration all of the input between the people we have had an opportunity to talk to within the membership—those individuals whom you have chosen at the presidents' level and the Management Council and the Championships Committee who try to come up with that compromise. We believe that it would achieve a significant meaningful reduction on the growing emphasis on the nontraditional segment, and it would do a lot of good for our student-athletes in terms of bettering their connection with the classroom because let's face it, if they're practicing, something else is being given up.

I urge you to adopt this proposal.

Joy Reighn (Rowan University): I'm a member of the Management Council. There is a very practical reason for this proposal that we don't recognize. Many schools and conferences are competing in the nontraditional segment not because they want to, but because they believe they must. They also compete with other noncollegiate programs that puts them at a disadvantage in terms of recruiting and competition. Leaving it up to institutions and conferences to eliminate competition in the nontraditional segment works about as well as unilateral disarmament did a few years ago. We will address this issue as a division. Thank you.

Ed Hegmann (Mary Washington College): I rise to ask you to defeat Proposition No. 55. Number one, it's not institutional control but institutional autonomy. I believe the institution ought to have the right and have the opportunity to play out this scenario the way they want to do it. I don't think it's an arms race. No one will ever take away all the advantages that your neighbors have. You need to

work harder to beat those advantages as you see them. So institutional autonomy is definitely an issue here.

Also, in terms of those folks who say if you don't compete in the nontraditional season, the student-athletes will then be able to exercise their academic responsibilities, I believe that's untrue and that it's clouded thinking. If you really believe that, I respect that and I feel that's fine. If you believe your student-athletes who are not competing are now going to go to the library or conduct institutional research or whatever, that's fine, if you truly believe that.

But what I'm really disturbed about is what the young lady from Rowan just said, and that is that it's not what you truly believe, it's what you're truly afraid of. You're afraid of a neighbor getting a little bit of an edge and you're afraid of an institution having something you can't and don't want to have. If you want to have traditional competition and nontraditional competition, then so be it. But if you don't want to have it or the conference doesn't allow you to have it, I think it's wrong to then say if I can't have it, then no one else should. I don't think that's really along the lines of integrity.

Second of all, and the last thing I want to mention is the student-athlete. Ced Dempsey and everybody at this conference talks constantly about student-athletes and how important student-athlete input is. Now we're saying that you have to have a student-athlete committee at every conference level, every institution. Here are student-athletes getting up and making passionate pleas and stating from the heart that if you eliminate competition from the nontraditional season, you're taking something away that's very dear to their hearts and not going to help their academic achievements.

For those reasons, I urge you to defeat soundly Proposition 55. (Applause)

Michael Hannah (Hobart and William Smith Colleges): I rise in opposition to Proposal 55 for three reasons. One, one of the wonderful things that competition in the nontraditional season has fostered are charity events. These typically are one-day multiteam round robins. A few of which I am very familiar with benefit the Leukemia Society of America and other foundations. It gives our student-athletes and coaches a chance to be very involved in a public service type of way that they wouldn't be able to in the traditional season.

Secondly, one of our concerns is to reduce stress on budget, facilities and staff. I suggest that having practices is a much better way to do that than having competition because practice conserves more of our budget and more of our facilities.

Thirdly, in this day and age, more of our campuses have far less junior varsity opportunities and programs than they've had in past years. Therefore, we're asking our paying customers, our third-year students, to make a varsity team and not have the opportunity that the junior varsity teams in the past provided.

Therefore, I think the nontraditional season serves a wonderful purpose for today's students because they don't have the opportunity

to be a member of a team or to develop as a student-athlete and enhance their athletic intercollegiate experience. It also gives our coaches an invaluable opportunity to fairly evaluate those student-athletes. Therefore, I'd ask that you vote against this proposal.

John Van Iwaarden (Hope College): I would like to speak to Proposal 55 from the standpoint of a faculty member in the department of mathematics at Hope College. I believe that allowing competition in the nontraditional segment would negatively affect resources, facilities, coaches and trainers, but most importantly to me, classroom activities. My calculus students are required to go to symposiums and lab sessions in the afternoons. We allow them to miss many of these during the regular season. Now we're asking them to miss more of their classroom activities in the nontraditional season.

I believe that student-athletes in Division III colleges are to be students. We must guard against using an increasing segment of their time for athletic competition outside of the regular season. Our coaches, first of all, are teaching faculty who need all of their available time to donate to faculty efforts, teaching, research, community service and so forth. Athletic directors already have a very difficult job of administering programs in regular seasons.

At Hope College, we are in favor of eliminating all nontraditional seasons, but let's not eliminate competition. Allow those to be teaching sessions pursuant to the Division III philosophy to allow students to be students first. (Applause)

Kenneth Magarian (Westfield State College): Since this began a couple years ago, I may have been at that time one of the ones who thought 55 was the way to go. Since that time, things that I have learned and read and asked changed my mind 100 percent. Obviously, the coaches and the athletes do not like 55. I really disagree. For almost all baseball, softball and soccer practices and games not in the regular season, coaches make sure they go out of their way to make sure that they do not miss any time from the academic scene whatsoever. Absolutely.

In our book, ladies and gentlemen, almost all of the amendments we have here this year is to do what? To deregulate. Also, they are to let each school decide what is best for them. Division III is enormous. Everything and everybody is different. Do not place this for everyone, everywhere. I urge the defeat of 55. (Applause)

Mr. Biddiscombe: Can I bring the meeting to order, please? The chair would like to suggest that comments that provide new information would be the most appropriate as we try to move through the discussion.

Dee Fairchild (Grinnell College): I'm a member of the Management Council. Most teachers agree on the inherent value of competing and practice opportunities in the nontraditional segment, while hoping that the student-athlete will still be able to conduct instruction. As has been said by other speakers and repeated, this proposal will also help to reduce demands on scarce institutional resources

like travel budgets, facilities, coaches and athletic trainers. These are very difficult issues on many campuses. This proposal is a significant step in the right direction. I encourage your support.

John Schael (Washington University): We have got a responsibility that needs to be with each campus, building its own resources and making decisions that are right for that particular program, not based on what is being done on other campuses. There is nothing in our legislation with respect to a requirement to conduct a nontraditional season or a nontraditional season with competition.

Also, I feel that it was important to have input from student-athletes. While we didn't contemplate a national survey, I know that on our campus we conducted a survey. We found that our students who are actively engaged in radio, newspaper, fraternities, sororities or being volunteers, were part of the academic effort of the institution. I also find that their grade-point averages across the board in all 18 sports were on equal footing with the nonathletes, so I don't see how competition during the nontraditional season detracts from their academic progress.

I believe a nontraditional season with the opportunity for competition also gives more freshmen, sophomores and juniors a special opportunity during that particular segment. Because the seniors are not involved, we can concentrate at a greater level in terms of helping them improve their skills.

A "no" vote on Proposition 55 is a vote for all the student-athletes representing our institutions at the Division III level. I urge your defeat of Proposition 55. (Applause)

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I would respectfully ask to call the question. (Applause)

Mr. Biddiscombe: Is there a second to call the question? Let me remind you that this will be a roll-call vote. It's a nondebatable motion. We're voting on to call the question.

[The motion to call the question was seconded and approved.]

Mr. Biddiscombe: We will now vote on Proposal 55 as amended. Please take your voting machines and cast your vote.

[Proposal No. 55 (Page A-62) was adopted, 158-155-5.]

We will now move on to Proposal No. 56. Just a moment, please. The polls were held for those people who had difficulty voting.

Unidentified Delegate: According to the technician back here, holding the polls open longer is not solving the problem for people in this area. You cast your vote, you don't get assurance that the vote has been received.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you. For those in the far corner, the only way we can be sure that we received those votes is for those members who are having a difficult time is to actually physically get up, come over to the center of the room or to the front and cast your vote for this very important vote.

Therefore, if there's no objection, the chair would ask for a revote

on 55 as amended, and ask those individuals to come forward. Again, this is obviously a crucial vote for us.

I'd like to clarify since I have heard no objections. The chair is asking for a revote on 55 with the amendment. I think we're ready. We will now revote. Please cast your vote.

The chair is now closing the polls.

Can I have your attention, please? First, I'd like to say that with the actual movement of people to the center of the room, there were 19 more votes cast, so we have a sense that that really, in fact, did work.

Women's Championships—Sponsorship Criteria— Minimum Period

Walter Johnson (North Central College): Does anyone in the room have a good, clean joke right now? (Laughter)

As a member of the Division III Management Council and chair of the Championships Committee and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 56.

[The motion was seconded.]

NCAA bylaws currently specify that a championship may be established in an emerging women's sport if at least 40 institutions sponsor the sport and the sport has met the women's sponsorship requirement for two consecutive years. The Championships Committee has reviewed the 1999-2000 sponsorship of the following sports: women's water polo, 40 institutions; women's ice hockey, 53 institutions; women's golf, 29; and women's bowling, 24 institutions. These sponsorship numbers represent an increase in the number of institutions that were sponsoring the sports for 1998-99.

If the waiting period is reduced from two years to one, legislation can be proposed to establish championships in those sports more quickly. This in turn should fuel additional sponsorship of those sports at member institutions. Ultimately, the proposal will provide more definitive opportunities for our student-athletes and assist member institutions in gaining their legal obligations under Title IX.

I think this is a great idea and I urge your vote for Proposal 56. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 56 (Page A-66) was adopted, 266-18-5.]

National Collegiate Championship—Women's Ice Hockey

Dee Fairchild (Grinnell College): As a member of the Division III Management Council and the Championships Committee, and on behalf of the Presidents Council, I move for the adoption of Proposal No. 57.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an effort to increase championship opportunities for women, the Association's governance structure proposes the establishment of a National Collegiate Championship in women's ice hockey. Currently, 53 institutions sponsor the sport of women's ice hockey; approximately one-half of those schools are in Division III. The estab-

lishment of a women's ice hockey championship necessitates the development of a committee on the playing rules and championship administration responsibilities, and the proposal also accomplishes that. Please note that the proposed sports committee will close in on the sports sponsorship battle.

The Presidents Council and Management Council want to emphasize that the adoption of this legislation is important for interim staff toward the establishment of a Division III women's ice hockey championship. The Division III Presidents Council intends to propose the establishment of a Division III championship in women's ice hockey at the 2001 NCAA Convention. Only the achievement of that ultimate goal will ensure championships access for our institutions that sponsor women's ice hockey and for our student-athletes.

I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 57.

Lee Pelton (Willamette University): As a member of the Presidents Council, I wanted to emphasize the importance of this issue in the eyes of the Presidents Council. The Association should give top priority to the funding of an Association-wide championship that provides equitable access opportunities to female ice hockey student-athletes in all three divisions. If this proposal is adopted, the Presidents Council will stress that point to the Executive Committee. At the same time, as you have heard, the Presidents Council believes that the only true way to guarantee equitable access for Division III student-athletes is to sponsor and pay for our own championship. So it is the intent of the Presidents Council to sponsor legislation that will enable the establishment of a championship in the sport of women's ice hockey. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 57 (Page A-67) was adopted, 262-3-17.]

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I have a question for the chair and the people at the podium. With the closeness of the vote on 55, and with all the problems we're having on the machines over here, how do we know all the votes got cast since the addition of all of the votes is very unbelievable today?

Mr. Biddiscombe: First of all, the people operating the voting machines felt that the relocation of those who were having a problem fixed the problem. But also, to verify that, we have a written record of all of the votes. The record will be available during the lunch break so that individual schools can verify their vote to make sure in fact their vote was recorded.

Mr. Kaiser: If a delegate didn't get up and move to the middle and if their vote wasn't cast, even though they voted, how are you going to know?

Mr. Biddiscombe: We will know because the written record will not indicate that they have voted.

Mr. Kaiser: Thank you. Then what happens?

Mr. Biddiscombe: We'll discuss that during the lunch break and have an answer for you immediately after the break.

Gloria Scott (Bennett College): I have a procedural question or

comment. On any vote being taken, if the chair gives direction on how that vote is to be taken, the members voting have an obligation to affirm to that. I think that any person who did not move, given the chance, because there was a clear problem, that's their own choice.

Number two, I think ultimately when you look at it, if they did not vote, they did not vote. I think that the process of reconsideration is already scheduled. I don't know of any technical way to go back to somebody who made a decision after the chair gave them an opportunity to conform to what the entire group was going to do. The only way to go back is to have reconsideration, and that opportunity is this afternoon. (Applause)

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you, President Scott, for those comments.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson University of New Jersey): My question is the same thing. In the highest previous vote, there were 454 votes cast. For Proposal 55, there were a total of 318 votes. That's a difference of 64 votes. Something there has to be going on. To have a 64-vote difference, I feel there's a problem that needs to be rectified. Thank you.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you, Art.

National Collegiate Championship—Women's Water Polo

Louise O'Neal (Wellesley College): I move the adoption of Proposal No. 58.

[The motion was seconded.]

In an effort to increase the NCAA championship opportunities for women, the Association's governance structure proposes the establishment of a National Collegiate Championship in women's water polo. Currently, at least 40 members sponsor women's water polo. This meets the NCAA minimum sponsorship number. This number has steadily increased. The establishment of a women's water polo championship also requires the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administration responsibilities. Please note that the composition of the proposed sports committee will reflect sports sponsorship data.

Therefore, the Presidents Council, the Management Council and the Championships Committee urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 58.

Carl Clapp (University of Redlands): I would like to speak in favor of Proposal 58. The growth of women's water polo is exceptional. Over the last few years, sponsorship on the varsity level has gone from four institutions to a total of 42—the most recent of which have been added since the NCAA declaration date in September. Furthermore, there are an additional seven more schools that have announced their intention to begin programs by 2001—the year the championship will be initiated. This would bring the total to 49 institutions, exceeding the 40 required.

Given the fact the women's championship will be held in May, es-

tablishing a championship in the 2000-01 academic year will afford the newly formed committee enough time to assign the date and site. Furthermore, since the women have been competing for the last several years, much of the groundwork has already been laid regarding rules and competitive structures. I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal and reduce the waiting period to one year.

[Proposal No. 58 (Page A-68) was adopted, 278-8-12.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Biddiscombe: I would like to remind the delegates that there will be a period of reconsideration this afternoon after lunch when we reconvene at 1:30. Someone who voted on the prevailing side of a proposal could move for reconsideration if so desired.

I want to thank you very much for your attention and cooperation this morning. I'll now turn the microphone back to President Die. Thank you.

Ms. Die: The period of reconsideration will begin at 1:30, regardless of when we leave to eat lunch. We will take a 10-minute break.

[Note: A recess was taken from 10:59 to 11:12 a.m.]

STRATEGIC PLAN DISCUSSION

Ms. Die: Please take your seats. We will begin. We have two items on our agenda prior to lunch.

Our next discussion is very significant. One of the first major policy decisions made in the new governance structure, and made also by the Presidents Council and the Management Council after the implementation of the new governance structure, was the development of the Division III strategic plan. The first plan was distributed to you in the fall of 1998. You will be interested to know that we remain the only division with a fully developed and implemented strategic plan.

All of the activity of our governance structure should focus on the plan. It is our governance right now. This is true not only as it relates to the development of policy issues, but also in the terms of allocation of revenues and expenses under the Division III budget. For that reason, we want to be sure the plan remains familiar to you. One of the ways to ensure this is briefly to review the status of the plan during our annual business session. To lead our discussion of this topic will be Lynda Calkins of Hollins University. As I noted earlier, Lynda is vice-chair of the Management Council and has served as chair of the Management Council's Strategic Planning Subcommittee. Lynda.

Lynda Calkins (Hollins University): Thank you, President Die. Good morning. It has been my privilege to serve on the Management Council for the past four years. We really have come a long way, but there's a long way yet to go. So it's my pleasure to present the strategic-planning report.

Division III continues to lead the Association in strategic planning. We are in the second full academic year of governance based on that strategic plan. Divisions I and II continue to develop their plans, although they are much closer in reality than they were at this time last year, especially Division II.

I will refer to two handouts during my presentation this morning. One packet has a blue cover and is entitled "Division III Strategic Plan." This document contains selected portions of our plan, and that will be our main focus. The other packet has a pink cover and is entitled "1999 Division III and Association-Wide Committee Reports." Unlike last year, we will not hear from the individual committee chairs regarding the activities of each committee. That information is contained in the written committee reports. We will, however, hear from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee since student-athlete issues remain a top priority in the strategic plan. I encourage you to review the committee reports because they do a good job of summarizing where each committee has been during the past year and where its focus will be in the future.

Let me briefly review how our strategic-planning process works. First, our Presidents Council and Management Council identify the top planning priorities. Those priorities then are communicated to each Division III and Association-wide committee. The committees then develop action plans that describe how they intend to address those priorities that fall in their area of expertise. All of this takes place on an annual basis so the plan is not a stagnant document.

Among the key players in the process are the committee chairs, the Management Council representatives on each committee and the staff liaisons. It is crucial that those individuals have a consistent focus and communicate closely regarding the applicable planning priorities. The Management Council representatives help keep the committee on task, and the governance staff helps keep the staff liaisons on task.

The other key concept to remember is that the plan governs the funding of postcommittee initiatives. If an initiative does not address one of the planning priorities, then the Management Council and the Presidents Council will not fund that proposal. Our plan continues to identify seven priorities: student-athlete welfare; membership requirements and education; communication and technology; sportsmanship and ethical conduct; the Division III identity; and the NCAA governance process. Section 5 of the handout reflects those seven priorities and in bold indicates those areas that are currently in progress. The sections that are in capital letters are the new initiatives added to the plan since last year. As you can see, a great many initiatives are currently underway.

Section 6 is a good document to review as well because it reflects what we have accomplished in each of the seven areas. While we are proud of what we have done, we cannot rest on our laurels because there is still much work to do.

I want to note that of the seven priority areas, the Presidents Council has determined that student-athlete welfare, membership education and diversity should receive top billing over the next few years. We will continue our efforts in the other four areas, of course, but they will receive just a little less attention. This will be especially important to keep in mind as the new resources become available with the implementation of the new CBS broadcast agreement in the year 2003. Because of our 3.18 percent constitutional guarantee of NCAA revenue, the new contract will give us an opportunity to pursue our priorities more aggressively.

We expect and encourage your ideas and input regarding how to accomplish all of these initiatives. But those suggestions must be consistent with our planning priorities in order to receive serious consideration. Since student-athlete welfare remains at the top of our priority list, we will be relying more than ever on our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee for advice and direction.

I would now like to ask Kerry Gotham, the chair of that committee, to present the SAAC report. Kerry was a student-athlete at Nazareth College in New York and now attends graduate school at Syracuse University. He has served as the SAAC chair during this last year and has been a colleague as the student-athlete representative on the Management Council during the past three years. It's through his dedicated service that he is a great example of how our student-athletes are making a significant and positive contribution within the new governance structure. Kerry.

STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

Kerry Gotham (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Thank you, Lynda, and good morning everyone. It is my honor to present this report highlighting the work of the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee during the past year. Exactly one year ago, we stood before the membership and stated that we would focus on maintaining consistent communication with student-athletes serving on NCAA committees and also create institutional and conference access to SAAC issues. I'm pleased to announce today that we stayed on target. We worked hard to obtain our main goals and established others for the future.

We now have Division III student-athlete representatives on over 11 Association-wide and Division III committees within the governance structure. This expands the opportunities for student-athlete involvement as well as the student-athlete voice. We also have established an annual reception with the members of the Management Council to maintain a good working relationship and provide a vehicle for interactive dialogue between the two groups.

On the issues of advisory committees at the conference level, we brought forth Proposal No. 50 to the Management Council, which was voted on earlier today. This will allow conference SAACs to increase the student-athlete influence at the conference level and strengthen the overall network of SAACs throughout the country.

On the issue of SAACs at the campus level, we have received numerous calls and e-mails from student-athletes and administrators requesting information and advice on how to better maintain their student-athlete advisory committees at their respective institutions and campuses. This shows a commitment to active student-athlete participation.

This is just a brief look at what we did over the year. It can be found in much greater detail, as we pointed out earlier, in the packets that were handed out in our written report. I would encourage each of you to read through the report and feel free to approach any one of the national SAAC members with any questions or concerns you may have. That's why we're here.

Thus, as we start another year of the governance cycle, the Division III SAAC will continue to serve as a watchdog with issues pertaining to health, safety and student-athlete welfare. We will continue to communicate with and help establish active campus and conference student-athlete advisory committees. We will continue to utilize our voice within the committee structure to maximize our involvement and increase opportunities.

With the new CBS basketball contract and the involvement of new funds for Division III, we are going to help identify educational programs dealing with alcohol education as well as other pertinent areas to the Division III philosophy and overall student-athlete experience.

Finally, on behalf of the committee, I would like to issue a challenge to the membership so that one year from now when we meet in beautiful, sunny Orlando, we will be able to look back and evaluate how we did. The mission of the Division III SAAC is to enhance the total athlete experience by promoting opportunity, protecting student-athlete welfare and fostering a positive student image while maintaining the tenets of the Division III philosophy. I would challenge you to look at your institutions and ask yourself two simple questions: How do you think you are doing with this mission? How do the student-athletes at your institution think you are doing? Ask them and see.

There's one other announcement that I would like to make. We have two members who have been with us for two to three years now and they are leaving our committee. We would like to recognize them at this time: Mike Hammond from Centre College and Cela Ocegueda, who is also our vice-chair, from the University of California at San Diego. They played an integral role over their terms, and we appreciate everything they have done. (Applause)

That's it for me. I would be happy to answer any questions at this time. If not, that concludes my report. Thank you.

Ms. Calkins: Thanks, Kerry. Let me close by emphasizing what an exciting time it is from a planning perspective within our division. Good planning does take time and a lot of hard work, but with good planning we can achieve the results that we all want and expect from

our governance structure. I'd like to open the floor if there are any questions at this time for either Kerry or myself. Seeing none, thank you.

Ms. Die: Thank you, Kerry, and thank you, Lynda. Thank you also to the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, committee chairs, committee members and the staff liaisons for their collective hard work in developing and implementing the plan and doing such a fine job of keeping us informed as to where we are in implementation. I know the membership is pleased with our accomplishments so far and is committed to the long-term success of the strategic plan.

Our next session focuses on the Institutional Self-Study Guide, often called the ISSG, and Division III financial aid requirements. Both of these topics require legislative requirements that are fundamental to successful membership in Division III.

First, you will hear from members of the Division III Membership Committee. The committee deals directly with ISSG and related membership issues. The ISSG is a critical document because it helps to identify potential problem areas where your institution or others may stray from the Division III philosophy or other legislative requirements. Leading off that discussion will be Marilyn Skrivseth, director of athletics at the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire, who chairs the committee.

Next, we will hear from our members of the Financial Aid and Awards Committee. As you know, much of the ISSG focuses on financial aid issues since that is a defining characteristic of our division. We also are in the third year of a comprehensive review of our division's financial aid and awards legislation. This is an important component of our strategic plan. The committee members will update you on the progress of their efforts, including what to expect during the remainder of this year and at the 2001 Convention. Leading off that discussion will be Jeff Ankrom, faculty athletics representative at Wittenberg University and chair of the Financial Aid and Awards Committee. We will begin with Marilyn Skrivseth. Marilyn.

INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY GUIDE DISCUSSION

Marilyn Skrivseth (University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire): Thank you. The Membership Committee is responsible for basically two aspects: one, reviewing issues related to Division III membership; and second, coordinating educational programs for both active and provisional members. I don't need to tell you at this point of discussion that Division III is the largest and certainly the most diverse division of the NCAA, and getting everyone on the same page sometimes can be a challenging task.

This past year, the committee has continued to conduct the four-year educational sessions for all divisional members and have increased our focus on educating our active members as well. We conducted our first-ever Division III videoconference on December 3.

You should each be receiving a copy of that videoconference shortly. I know the Membership Committee will look forward to your feedback.

Another activity to better educate our members is today's session being held in conjunction with the Financial Aid and Awards Committee. But before I get started, I'd like to introduce some members of our committee, so if you do have any questions on the ISSG, you'll feel more comfortable contacting them.

First, we have Kitty Baird, senior woman administrator from Centre College; Gordon Collins, faculty athletics representative from the College of Wooster; Christopher Dahl, president, State University College at Geneseo in New York; Carol Fritz, senior woman administrator, Western Maryland College; Marcia Kierscht, president, Stephens College; and Michael Walsh, athletics director, Washington and Lee University. Charlie Titus, athletic director at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, was unable to join us today.

Today's topic is on the Institutional Self-Study Guide. Each of you should have a copy of this guide. We'll review the philosophy behind the ISSG as well as the time line and process by which the ISSG should be completed. At the end of our presentation, we'll answer some frequently asked questions before turning the session over to the Financial Aid and Awards Committee. To begin with, I'd like to ask President Marcia Kierscht to discuss the philosophy of the ISSG.

Marcia Kierscht (Stephens College): Thank you, Marilyn. The intent of the Institutional Self-Study Guide is to provide an internal self-study document for Division III institutions that emphasizes the Division III philosophy statement. It presents a more appropriate alternative to external evaluation programs. The intent is to involve senior-level administrators both inside and outside of athletics in a study that will enhance their knowledge of your athletic programs. It's very important that we bring together presidents, deans of students—all those who would have something to do with our student-athletes—to study our programs.

It also sensitizes senior-level administrators to the strengths and weaknesses of their athletic programs, and it identifies specific areas of our Division III athletic programs and reinforces appropriate current practices or identifies areas that require further attention. The ISSG is also intended to address and evaluate diversity and gender issues. We hope, in completing the ISSG, that we will accomplish all of those goals. Now, I'll turn it over to Mike Walsh, who will discuss the time lines for completing the ISSG.

Mike Walsh (Washington and Lee University): Thanks, Marcia. In accordance with NCAA Constitution 6.3.1, the ISSG must be completed at least once every five years. Once the ISSG is completed, only the notification-of-completion form should be submitted to the NCAA office. This form must be signed by the chief executive officer, director of athletics, senior woman administrator, faculty athletics representative, director of financial aid and director of admissions.

The date the ISSG was completed must be indicated on the notification-of-completion form. Please remember that only this form should be returned to the NCAA national office. The remainder of the ISSG should be kept at your institution.

Once the notification-of-completion form is received at the national office, you will receive your new ISSG due date based on the date indicated on the completion form. Approximately one year before the due date, a new ISSG will be mailed to the chief executive officer. Institutions should keep in mind that waivers or extensions of the five-year due date are not permitted. It is a violation if an ISSG is not completed prior to the institution's due date.

I'll let Gordon Collins discuss the process by which the ISSG should be completed.

Gordon Collins (College of Wooster): Thanks, Mike. If each of us were on the same page of this ISSG document, with its 27 pages, it would be a miracle. The completion of the ISSG should include a wide variety of constituents, including, of course, the president or CEO, but it is not limited to such people. The athletic director, primary woman's administrator, faculty athletic representatives, various coaches, the director of admissions, the director of financial aid also should complete the form. In fact, I guess you would say that in the completion of the ISSG, everybody in this room should be involved in the completion of this document at your institution.

The committee on your campus may also involve additional participants, such as the medical or the training staff or the director of student services. Following this initial completion of the ISSG, and it does take some time, as you can imagine, you will debate whether you are all on the same page as to whether you agree with the various responses to the various items. The group may want to perform some follow-up checks related to some areas of concern that they've identified. They may also develop a written action plan addressing specific areas of concern that were identified while completing this ISSG.

The best way to complete the ISSG is to engage as many campus constituents as deemed to be reasonable. That might even include everybody from the equipment manager to the college counselor. It is not intended to be a completed, whole document by the athletic department. It's clear from the above-mentioned persons that that's true.

Using this process, the ISSG will accomplish the goals that Marilyn outlined at the start of our presentation. At this point, I'll answer some frequently asked ISSG questions. Those of us on the Membership Committee often get these questions from prospective and provisional members of the NCAA Division III membership group.

The first frequently asked question is: What should we do with this completed ISSG and where should it be filed? Should it be filed in the athletic director's office? That's one place where it may be filed. It might certainly show up also in the library. Everybody who

worked on the ISSG should have a copy of it, and it might well be shared with prospective students and so forth. It's not something you file away in a drawer for four years and dust off when it's time to fill out the next one. It might well be shared with prospective student-athletes, among other persons.

Another frequently asked ISSG question is: Can we complete the ISSG more than once in a five-year period? That may seem a little silly, as laborious as it is. But there are those who use this document to maintain some attention to where they are in their intercollegiate athletic program. The answer, therefore, is that you may absolutely do it more than every five years. That's the minimum required. Its use as an evaluation tool can be repeated at any time. The ISSG often is completed when a new senior-level administrator is hired at the institution. In the case of the College of Wooster, we did this when we hired a new director two years after we had originally filled this out.

Finally, a third question is: Where can institutions get help in completing the ISSG? Another frequently asked question is: Could I ask other friends and other institutions? Well, you might, but as is always the case, the institution should contact the NCAA national office for help with the ISSG.

I hope these questions and their answers are helpful to you and your institution as you complete the ISSG. Financial aid is one section the ISSG focuses its intent on. This leads us to the second half of this presentation, a discussion by the Division III Committee on Financial Aid. But if you have further questions about this ISSG, either for me or any member of our Division III Membership Committee, please don't hesitate to ask. Thank you.

Jeff Ankrom (Wittenberg University): Thank you all and thank you for listening. The first thing I would like to do is introduce the committee. Then I would like to give you a rough-and-ready idea of what the organization of our presentation will be and then present to you what I think the big issues are that we're going to be talking about.

As far as the committee structure goes, we're a unique committee. We have a variation in structure. We have an FAR, myself; we have two presidents; we also have a student; and we have a couple of people—as well as ADs—who have given us the admissions, financial aid, institutional research, enrollment and planning perspective. They have been very important to our committee, and I think helped us understand goals: Karen Johnson from Alfred University, and Georgette DeVeres from Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps. You can see the rest of the membership of the committee.

I'm going to spend 15 minutes or so giving you our basic presentation. There will be some time for questions and hopefully answers. The format is the usual.

We believe that this whole question of financial aid is at a crossroads. To this point, we have been very cautious in our approach.

When the committee was first put together, we wanted to charge ahead and ask a bunch of tough questions and survey and really get to the bottom of things about what's going on out there. But we were told to cool our jets by the Management Council and presidents. We quickly understood that education has to be the focus.

I've gone through a couple of years explaining some very basic things to you at the Conventions. What we've all understood is that we have a very tricky problem. Financial aid is a very tricky problem. As I understand it, this is the way I think about it as an economist. I think each school out there has a rule for awarding financial aid. All of the factors come into play in that rule—obviously need, academic ability, other factors may come into the equation.

But it's my understanding—it's my impression, at least—without doing hard-core research on this, that each of us are probably applying the rule that we have at our institution appropriately and consistently. But, of course, the problem is that across institutions, there is a variation in these rules themselves. So it's quite understandable when the student-athlete applies at two different places and they get two different aid packages and people begin to wonder what's wrong, what's going on? One answer is there's nothing wrong, it's just another facet of institutional autonomy.

I think the big question we want you to think about is whether or not we want to continue with that situation, which basically means that there are 400-and-some institutions out there applying their rule to their prospective students, and therefore we should account for that and have a self-trust, self-monitoring mechanism within our institution. The next step would be to open up our practices and policies and possibly go so far as to open up our aid packages and get serious about monitoring each other. I'm going to try to answer this. Hopefully, you will hear the presentation and be stimulated to think about that.

I'm going to at this point turn it over to Georgette DeVeres, who will talk about the new section of the ISSG and remind you again how these admission requirements work.

Georgette DeVeres (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges): The ISSG is the beginning of allowing us to open more discussion and education along the financial aid and admission area and integrate a lot of the financial aid policies that currently exist on our campuses to make sure they are in compliance with some of our Division III requirements in the award of financial aid. The purpose of the ISSG will help financial aid offices in conjunction with the athletic departments to reinforce the fact that financial aid plays an integral part of the athletics program. It also will allow us to re-examine if our current policies need to be reinforced and to identify areas that require further attention.

Over the last two years I have served on this committee, it has been eye-opening for me to see that a lot of policies that we have in place in our financial aid offices took some reexamining to make sure

that we are in compliance with the other rules that we are required to follow, such as the department of education, our institutional policies, as well as Division III policies at the NCAA.

The ISSG will allow us to examine our policies and procedures on our campuses and make sure that our policies are integrated with all the rules and regulations that we must adhere to within the financial aid arena. It will also allow us to apply consistency to our awarding process as we award students financial aid, taking into account the regulations we must adhere to. It also allows us to review our publications that we currently disseminate to our publics, our students and to our families to make sure that we are, in fact, adhering to what we say we do in terms of the types of awards that we offer our students.

Even though the ISSG is submitted every five years to the NCAA, I think the document encourages you to look annually at your policies within your institution, because as you know, there are numerous changes that take place in the financial aid world, particularly that come from the Department of Education. As these changes occur, it takes a lot of tweaking and reexamining to make sure that your institutional policies are in compliance with all the areas we have to adhere to.

We have completed a long process of submission requirements and reviewing awards. Walter is going to be giving you an update on that shortly. But I think the ISSG will help prompt a review of that process. Even though you still need to submit new award information to our committee to make sure that you are in compliance with Division III guidelines, the ISSG will help you to think about the requirements that go along with awards of circumstances and nonathletic achievement awards. I think we have achieved a lot of education in the last couple of years in helping institutions understand what the requirements were for institutions to be able to award those moneys to students on their campus.

Walter now will give you an update about the future perspectives of Division III financial aid. Thank you.

FINANCIAL AID DISCUSSION

Walter Johnson (North Central College): We seem to have been at this process forever. We ask you to send information in. You send in information. Then we get back to you and say that's not what we wanted, we want more. You send us more.

It kind of reminds me of a story my 10-year-old daughter told me about a duck that went into a store and asked the gentleman, "Pardon me, sir, do you sell duck food?" The gentleman said, "No, we don't sell duck food." The duck left. He came back the next day, "Pardon me, sir, do you sell duck food?" The gentleman looked at the duck and said, "No, we don't sell duck food." The duck left and came back the next day, "Pardon me, sir, do you sell duck food?" The gentleman said, "I told you we didn't sell duck food. And if you come in here and ask

me that question again, I'm going to nail your beak to the floor." The duck left, came back the next day, he said, "Pardon me, sir, do you sell nails?" The gentleman said, "No." He said, "Well, do you sell duck food?" (Laughter)

So this process kind of reminds me of that. It just seems to never end. Let me give you an idea of where we are now. There are 423 active and provisional members of the Association that we're evaluating. Three-hundred-eighteen have been through the initial process and have completed what we've asked for. But the process is ongoing. Even though everything you might have sent in at this point has been approved, if you in fact have a new scholarship established on your campus, a new process that might be put in place, you need to submit that for Division III also. Eighty-five institutions have indicated that they do not offer awards of circumstance or nonathletic achievement awards. One-hundred-five institutions have either not been reviewed at this point or have been reviewed and have been asked to submit additional information.

So we still have some in the pipeline. I talked to some of you who said you haven't heard back from us. Part of it might be that we got your initial information and did the initial review, and you're in the process of having a response that says we need something else. Or, you just haven't responded to our initial request. There could be a combination of things.

What have we found in the process? It's been really interesting because there are differing methodologies and philosophies in granting and distributing financial aid. That's one of the things that we have really had difficulty with in trying to determine how institutions go about setting up their financial aid processes. Ellen will cover that in detail a little later.

We found some broad language that's being used. We found language that is very clear in some cases. Institutions are very specific and it's really easy to determine whether or not student-athletes are gaining an advantage through the financial aid process. There are others that you really can't tell because of how the scholarships are awarded. There are even those where it's so direct and so blatant, you have to stop and scratch your head and wonder what did they miss here.

We found things about giving to a student who has participated in cocurricular or extracurricular activities. That's kind of broad. What does that really mean? So we try to put a finger on what exactly are they trying to accomplish. We came across giving to a student who shows leadership in an extracurricular or cocurricular activity out of high school. Again, that's very broad and somewhat vague and needs a little more interpretation. We've also found something more direct like giving to a student who participates in wrestling from a particular region. I don't know, that sounds like an athletic scholarship to me.

But, you know, one of the things that I feel like I've been taught over the years by people who have helped guide me is that you always

want to assume good faith. You always want to assume that people are trying to do it the right way. They give you reasons where we wonder whether or not you can stick to that creed, don't they? But we've really tried to be fair and we've really tried to be diligent about getting back to everyone. I know there are still some institutions that are waiting to figure out what's going on. Over this next year, we're hoping that we can complete the process.

Ellen Shilkret (Vassar College): I'm the associate director of financial aid at Vassar College. I'll try to keep this as quick as possible because I know we all want to get to lunch.

I have been asked to give a brief history of these analyses—where we were, where we are now and where we think we might be heading in the future. Once upon a time, many years ago, life in the financial aid office was very simple. There was a uniform methodology used to determine need and most financial aid packages were basically the same. Need was met with first federal loans, then a campus job, then finally grant aid.

Seven or eight years ago, the federal government, in trying to open up financial aid and making it more accessible to all middle-income families, decided to change that methodology and arrived at its own formula called federal methodology, which we know as "FM". What this did was take the formula and throw home equity out of the picture, because they felt that was something that might impact the formula. They also decided to go into a number-crunching system, whereby they take taxes, take your adjusted gross income, throw them into a formula and come up with a need.

When that happened, many colleges with limited institutional grant aid did not feel that this formula was a fair assessment. So they came up with their own institutional methodology, which we know as "IM" in our field. Institutional methodology put home equity back into the picture, and instead of becoming a number-crunching formula, it boosted the income, assets and relative state of finances as they compare to all other students who apply for aid.

Further complicating this picture, just this year, the College Scholarship Service came up with their own different kind of methodology. There are a lot of colleges out there that are under this College Scholarship Service. What the College Scholarship Service did was try to provide a compromise between FM and IM.

So where does this lead us? This leads us to different methodologies resulting in different amounts of need. In other words, we do not have a level playing field among colleges, as Jeff had mentioned before. Family contributions and need, rather than being consistent as they were for many years, now show a wide range due to the different formulas that are being used by institutions. The wider range can be as low as several hundred dollars to as much as many thousands of dollars, as evidenced by the many phone calls that I get after our award packages are mailed out to our students. Parents call and want to negotiate or appeal the award because one school gave their

child a better award package than somebody else.

Our awards are also changing to attract students. We are all aware that many institutions want the same student. In order to attract that student, schools are changing the components of the financial aid award, which is fine if it's within federal regulations. Other schools do these in maintenance systems to be able to provide the kind of class that the presidents and the trustees of the college desire. There appears to be a very strong belief out there among financial aid directors, college admission administrators and athletic coaches that more attractive packages are being required to attract athletes.

As the following example shows, I just wanted to show you what happens when schools use different methodologies. In Example A, we have a school where the cost of education is \$15,000. The family's contribution has been determined to be \$5,000, thus leaving a need of \$10,000. This particular school has decided to award that student a \$2,625 federal subsidized loan, which is the maximum that a freshman can have, a \$1,300 federal work-study job, and the remainder of \$6,075 in an institutional grant. All of this adds up to \$10,000.

We have another institution, and let's say that that college's sticker price is exactly the same, \$15,000. Let's say that the family's contribution that they arrived at was also \$5,000, leaving a \$10,000 need. But this particular college wanted to attract the student. So they offered that need of \$10,000 totally up front with grant aid. They still provided a \$2,625 federal loan, which now is unsubsidized, and \$1,000 in institutional employment. Those bottom two components, the unsubsidized loan and the institutional employment, are fine within federal regulations and are allowed.

So what we have is, under Example A, a student who got a grant of \$6,025 total aid of \$10,000; and under Example B, a student who got a \$10,000 grant with almost \$13,000 in aid. What this leads to is topics for discussion. Are we working with a level playing field among Division III schools with regard to financial aid packages?

In closing, I just wanted to mention that the Financial Aid Committee has developed a survey that we will be able to send post-Convention so we can get some feedback as to which direction we should go. I also want to mention that because we feel that this topic is so very important and because we feel that we need to keep the lines of communication open between financial aid and the NCAA. When the National Association of Financial Aid Administrators holds their national conference in Washington, D.C., July 8 through July 12 this summer, we have been approved to have an intercession to discuss these items.

Now we're going to go back to our closing, which is to deal with the discussion items at bay. First item for discussion: Are we working with a level playing field among all Division III schools in regard to financial aid packages? Two, should legislation be proposed that would standardize the manner in which we separate it to provide a level playing field? Next, NCAA Bylaw 15.3.2.4 requires financial aid

awards to include a statement of the amount, duration, conditions and terms of the award. Should legislation be proposed that would require institutions to disclose their needs analysis policies in writing, and/or should institutions be asked to submit their needs analysis policies to an impartial body and who would then be able to explain how the institution should determine the financial aid award?

I'll turn it back over to you, Jeff.

Jeff Ankrom (Wittenberg University): So we have some time for questions and answers. We have a few of our other committee members in the audience.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference of Independent Colleges): It isn't a question; it's a comment. As a commissioner, I'm sitting with one of my ADs and he asked me, "Who gets that form we fill out?" There's always a puzzle as to where it goes on a campus. Can commissioners be sent just the cover letter as to where it's gone, so that we can let our ADs know where it is, find it and get it done?

Mr. Ankrom: You're not talking about the ISSG form, you're talking about the nonathletic achievement?

Mr. Dodson: The whole series. She mentioned a quiz or something going out where you could ask questions about financial aid. Whatever goes out, if we know where it is, we can help. If we don't know, we just can't help.

Mr. Ankrom: We hope we can clarify the process by adding a new section to the ISSG. The old ISSG did not include the financial aid-related questions. That's one step that our committee is hoping to do. We hope it improves the situation.

James Appleton (University of Redlands): It seems to me that a very key feature of our work is to ensure internal consistency within the given institution. Beyond that, I'm not sure how far we're able to go. But whatever the particular plan of a given institution is, whether it's a matrix system or whether the institutional grant is placed in the package first or last, it seems to me that the key feature is the institutions documenting that there is no incorrect packaging when comparing an athlete on our rosters and a nonathlete on our rosters.

It's not like Division I where you have a roster at the beginning of the year that's constant, so that would have to be taken into account. But the key feature, it seems to me, and the philosophy of Division III, is that there is no differential between the athlete and nonathlete no matter what the award packaging is between a given institution. So that in either one of those examples, if there were 15 students who were selected from A and B institutions, and there were 10 athletes and five nonathletes and there were differences in the way the nonathlete and the athlete was funded, then we have a serious problem. But if within that institution, there's a comparability in how those athletes and nonathletes are funded, then it seems to me we at least have a solid starting point in our athletic Division III philosophy.

At the University of Redlands, we have a matrix system. I can't imagine how we could come in and look at 10 athletes and 10 nonathletes unless I were to give you a particular box in that matrix, which I would be willing to give to you at any given time. If you would take a look at every student who did that matrix, differentiating between athlete and nonathlete, and if there were differences within that box of the matrix, I'm in violation of the Division III philosophy. If there is no difference within that, then at the core of the matter, I am not in violation at all. I think we have to start there.

Walter Johnson (North Central College): One of the discussions we had at our committee meeting yesterday morning brought up a couple of things. One was talking about whether or not we needed to revisit the legislation and just eliminate all the verbiage and get to the core issue—there should not be any difference between what kind of financial aid is given to a student-athlete versus a nonstudent-athlete, and to let that try to hold us true as an Association because we are very different in terms of what our needs are, etc.

The other was the idea of doing some form of disclosure, which I think has some merit, depending on what direction the Association might want to go. The question is how would we go about dealing with that disclosure? One thought was to simulate in some way the drug-testing system that exists at a championship level. You would take a number of athletes in terms of their packages and nonathletes from institutions who qualify for the Final Four or final eight or whatever it was and compare. If the comparison came out that there really wasn't any difference, that might be a way of determining whether or not as institutions we're abiding within the spirit, if not the letter, of the legislation. It was a couple of things that we thought through briefly yesterday at our meeting.

Jeff Ankrom (Wittenberg University): Are there any other comments? Seeing none, I'll turn it back to President Die. (Applause)

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Die: Thanks to the panelists and members of both committees for your presentations. Thanks also to the delegates for your input. I urge all of you to monitor closely this topic during the coming year since it may well be a legislative topic at next year's Convention.

Lunch will be served until 1 o'clock. After lunch, we will return to this room and reconvene at 1:30 sharp. Our first order of business this afternoon will be to open the window of reconsideration regarding this morning's proposals. John Biddiscombe will handle that. Then we will begin our afternoon discussion sessions regarding gender and ethnic diversity, deregulation and amateurism. Our afternoon is full. Thank you, and enjoy your lunch. We are adjourned.

[The business session was adjourned for lunch at 12:09 p.m., reconvening at 1:31 p.m.]

Monday Afternoon, January 10, 2000

OPENING REMARKS

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): As indicated before we broke for lunch, the first order of business this afternoon is to provide the opportunity for the window of reconsideration to be opened. I'd like to say a few words about this process in the event there is someone interested in moving that. As we indicated before lunch, a motion needs to be made by someone from the prevailing side. It can be seconded by anyone. The following debate on the reconsideration should cover the motion and the merits of the question to be reconsidered. It cannot be amended, and the vote will be determined by a roll-call vote and it requires a majority.

If the motion to reconsider is defeated, it may not be reconsidered at another time. If it passes, then we go back to the original question as though the prior vote was never taken. Debate and a roll-call vote will be required and a majority vote will be required as it was done previously. If the original question is defeated, it cannot be reconsidered again at this Convention. That question did come up.

Are there any questions? If not, the window of reconsideration is now open.

Gloria Scott (Bennett College): I have a procedural question so we're all clear. Are the machines that were not working now in a position to be working, should we move for the next vote? Are they in the right places to be counted?

Mr. Biddiscombe: It is my understanding that many of the delegates who felt their vote, or maybe we have found that their vote was not recorded, have been provided a new voting machine and hopefully that will solve that problem.

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Playing and Practice Seasons— Competition in Nontraditional Segment

Bob Mullen (University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth): I voted on the prevailing side of 55 as amended. I'd like it to be brought up for reconsideration. (Applause)

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. Biddiscombe: The chair will now make a suggestion in order to be certain that this vote will be recorded correctly. Before we vote on the reconsideration, we would like to do a test vote to be certain that those machines that have been distributed since the morning session and those individuals whose vote may not have been recorded can have an opportunity to have their machine verified. So please take out your voting machines. This will be a test vote. We're going to ask all individuals to press No. 1; is that correct? That's the procedure. All those in the area that we've had a difficult time, move to a location that is in closer proximity to the voting table so that we

can be certain that we receive all the electronic votes. The polls are open. Please pass your test vote. Please press No. 1. We'll continue to keep the polls open, so please be patient with us. I don't want to recognize any delegates as speakers at this time because I don't want those up at the table to miss out. We are closing the polls.

Obviously, there's confusion and we're not certain that we can rectify the technical problems in time to proceed, so the chair will suggest the following. We will take the vote of reconsideration by paddle vote. If we deem that it passes, and need to vote on the proposal again, we will do a ballot vote of each institution so that we can have an accurate count and a record of those who voted either for, against or abstained on the proposal.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I appreciate your efforts because it's obvious the machine is still having problems, but there might be an easier way. Have the lady who is at the computer do a printout of all the votes that were cast. For those institutions that do not register a vote, which can't be too many but it might be, have those institutions either revoke or come up and make another hand-in vote with her as many of us had to do previously.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you for that suggestion.

Will the members of the Presidents Council who are in attendance please come forward to the speakers' platform?

I'd like to respond to the delegate's suggestion about how to solve this problem. The chair would like to rule that there seems to be such discrepancy between the number of votes that are being cast in the test vote and the results at the voting center that we're going to proceed with a paddle vote followed by written ballot. That way, we can be certain that in fact we have registered all delegates' votes on this issue. The Presidents Council is convening right now to discuss the procedural issue. They have authority to change what has been the published method for voting on roll-call votes, so we cannot proceed with my recommendation until we have their approval.

The Presidents Council has given the chair the authority to conduct a paddle vote for the reconsideration. All those in favor of reconsideration, please raise your paddle. All those who would vote against reconsideration, please raise your paddle. All those who would abstain, please raise your paddle.

The staff indicates that the reconsideration motion has passed. So we will now open the motion to discuss the merits of Proposal 55-1, as amended. Would the delegates who would like to speak please come to the microphone?

John Galgano (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Good afternoon, everyone. For this meeting, our committee chose only seven proposals on which to speak, feeling most adamant about the defeat of Proposal No. 55. The earlier vote regarding nontraditional seasons was disheartening, not because our position was unsuccessful, but because we did not feel we were given a chance to fully express our views. Lynda Calkins, vice-chair of the Division III Management

Council, said this morning that committees and the membership are relying more and more on input and advice from the Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Well, this is what we have to say.

Division III student-athletes are as passionate about our schools as we are about our sports. This is why we are Division III athletes. We are given four short years to compete on the intercollegiate level and get the most out of our experience. I can say before you now with an honest heart I know more about life and what it means to be a good person on the field. This is why Division III athletics are so special. We are taught how to play the game of life on the field. Our moments on the field to play are few, and most of us will never have this competitive experience again. Take away even one of the competitive opportunities that we have, and it would be a failure to see the passion of the Division III athlete. Thank you. (Applause)

Linda Moulton (Clark University): I would like to remind the delegates of our philosophical and historical roots and the fact that the nontraditional season was not created but evolved primarily as a result of the influence of Division I. I don't believe that many of us sitting in this room ever imagined that we would be talking about the kinds of things we have been talking about today. Over time, we have managed to significantly diminish the number of multisport athletes and those student-athletes who simply want to be a part of campus life. We have also all but managed to dictate that our coaches specialize.

It is difficult for those of us who are advocates of the student voice, who do care and who do listen, to stand in opposition of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee's position. However, there are certain areas and issues that clearly those of us with ultimate responsibility for our program must do what we believe is the best for our athletes, our coaches and our staffs. In this instance, it should transcend supporting coaches and athletes who have successful programs and who request that we must have a nontraditional season to continue to be successful. That is not always true.

In this instance, there are many of us who believe it is not better. It further closes the gap with varied differences that we have always prided ourselves with Division III membership versus our colleagues in Division I. I am for those of us who are in favor of taking the discretions a step further to see this as at least a step toward other different and perhaps better changes in the system and not vote down this proposal.

I urge your support for Proposal 55. (Applause)

Jim Appleton (University of Redlands): I wish to reiterate support for this legislation and encourage your approval. I agree with everything Linda has just said, so I'm going to limit my thoughts to two. First, some, including the student-athletes, unfortunately misread the definition of participation. In Division III, participation is defined as providing opportunity for the largest number of our students to participate in the widest variety of individual and sports

competition at our universities. It is not defined as year-long competition. I think this point is very important for us to consider. To think otherwise is to think more like Division I and not as Division III.

Maybe more importantly, though, is to add this point. For those of us here, and I think everyone in the room would just about qualify, who worked very hard to pay attention to student opinion, to value student opinion, want to use student opinion in our decision-making. I believe the support that's illustrated in this occasion is not a vote against student-athletes or their opinion, it simply means that we must pay attention not only to student opinion, but to presidents and faculty athletic representatives and others at universities as we look at what's best for the entire institution and the students who are our responsibility.

To support this legislation is not a vote against student-athletes. To the contrary. The Presidents Council and the Management Council, and I for one at least, listen carefully to student-athletes. In this regard, the legislation does not take away the opportunity for students to participate in athletics at our institutions, just out-of-season competition.

This legislation is a reasonable position that reestablishes a way to resolve some very difficult issues. One is our interest in the student-athlete and the student-athlete's opportunity; but on the other hand, the stress of space, facilities, resources, coaches, academic planning and the few student-athletes who wish the opportunity to participate in more than one sport. This is not a vote against student-athletes; it is to take into account the complexity of this issue and develop a resolution, even a compromise, that allows for us to maintain the philosophy in Division III. We do not want to be want-to-be's Division I.

Stanley Caine (Adrian College): As a member of the Presidents Council, let me speak quite specifically to the golf and tennis issue from two points of view. The impression should not be left that the Presidents Council had a series of concrete proposals related to golf and tennis that we considered and in some way rejected. I know from my point of view that I received a number of letters from student-athletes and from coaches concerning golf and tennis. Most all of them concerned tennis. Most all of them concerned the Rolex tournament. They had great concern about that specific tournament.

We did not have before us in our discussions a day or so ago, however, concrete proposals to consider that would have dealt with the complexities of their concerns. So we did not in that regard deal with the issues of golf and tennis. We, in fact, understand that we need to entertain a more deliberative process to consider golf and tennis, and we have charged the Management Council with the responsibility of meeting with representatives of the golf and tennis community to examine what reasonable alternatives there might be and to bring some of that information to us.

The second comment: Why is golf and tennis different than some

of the other sports we've been talking about? The greatest difference I see is that tennis and golf are sports that you can participate in as an individual or in a team format. Much of the protest that I've heard concerned the issue of individuals participating as individuals and not as a team in team competition. That's something that we need to give some consideration to, but that's the reason why we think golf and tennis is a more complicated issue and one that deserves some deliberation. We recognize that the golf and tennis community did not sense early enough that this proposal included them. We want to give them some opportunity to look seriously at what might be some differences here and try to consider how it fits.

With that in mind, I continue to speak in favor of the proposal, urging the fact that it speaks to the distinctive philosophy of Division III. It attempts to speak to the proper balance between academics and athletics. It attempts to ensure a level playing field for all of our members. At the core—I think President Appleton said it well—it attempts to support the best interest of the students at our institutions who wish to participate in athletics as part of their educational experience. Please continue to support the proposal.

Jennifer McGrath (Colby-Sawyer College): I sincerely appreciate the student-athlete perspective and the wishes of coaches and administrators. But I think we also have to look at reality and what is the right thing to do for our institutions and for our student-athletes. I am for the student-athlete. In reality, aside from the academic issues and aside from all the financial issues that have already been raised, one issue that really has not been raised today is that we as administrators haven't fully assessed the demands of the athletic training support needed for our programs.

At Colby-Sawyer, we're fortunate. We have a curriculum-certified program with four certified trainers and 60 student trainers in a school of 850. We have four winter opportunities, so there are 11 opportunities for student-athletes to participate in nontraditional and traditional sports. I don't know how those of you without curriculum programs are going to sustain the quality of care that student-athletes need in both segments.

The student-athlete in the nontraditional segment is just as important and just as deserving of care as the student-athlete in the traditional segment. This is where my concern comes from. We need to ensure that we can provide a quality experience for our student-athletes to develop appropriately during both the traditional and nontraditional seasons.

From that perspective, I asked my student-athletes before Christmas how they felt about the legislation. I did listen. Their biggest concern—and I'm saying this to the Presidents Council—was taking the nontraditional season away from them. We can live without competition, but we want to have the opportunity to play our sport, even to practice it. This is coming from multisport athletes as well as single-sport athletes.

This legislation I really believe is good legislation and I urge its support. I believe it addresses the concerns of administrators while still allowing quality educational experiences for our student-athletes and a developmental nontraditional season. Thank you. (Applause)

Megan Stevens (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I'm speaking to you again in regard to this morning's vote on Proposal No. 55 and as a student-athlete on the advisory committee. We are a committee of student-athletes from all over the United States with the sole purpose of advising you on the perspectives of other student-athletes. Together, we are 24 members of a national committee. We are representing the views of more than 127,000 student-athletes nationwide in Division III. The leaders of our division, the NCAA Presidents Council and the Management Council, have stated that student-athlete welfare is a top priority of the division.

As mentioned last night by NCAA President Ced Dempsey, we are a part of the NCAA's second 100 years. Part of this mission is the total development of the student-athlete. We, the student-athletes, believe that competition, even in the off season, is vital to this development. So if we are focusing on student-athletes and student development, shouldn't we be listening to the student-athlete voice?

I stand before the finest in Division III—presidents, athletic directors, coaches and athletes. As SAAC members, it is our understanding that we are all in this together. It is our hope that we all come together in the understanding that this issue is again an institutional choice. We know that there are members who simply cannot afford budgetarily to provide these opportunities to their athletes. However, we also feel that those institutions whose budgets can support nontraditional programs should be afforded this opportunity as should the student-athletes at these institutions.

Once again, in closing, speaking for the 127,000 student-athletes who participate in your institutional programs, we respectfully urge you to defeat this proposal. (Applause)

Dewayne Barnes (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee believes that if Proposal No. 55 passes, there will be a decrease in so-called "captains practices." In these instances, coaches and trainers will not be present, forcing practices to go underground and severely undermining the philosophy of protecting student-athlete welfare. Please defeat this proposal. Thank you.

Tim Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): I rise in strong support of Proposal 55. It seems that the essence of the argument of this proposal is institutional autonomy. We've heard that a lot. If you buy that, then I suggest the need for this 365-page Manual is questioned. Miscellaneous institutional autonomy is printed in all these things. If we're going to let nontraditional seasons run rampant, why do we have contest limitations? Why do we have only one of these seasons? Why aren't those governed by institutional autonomy? What is the difference?

We have this Manual for a reason. There are inherent reasons why we will never have a level playing field, but at least we have 365 pages of sanity to help the cause. If we're consistent with the notion of institutional autonomy, the logical conclusion would be to discard this Manual and effectively have no reason for this entire organization. The reason we are here today is to generate commonality and not trumpet institutional autonomy. (Applause)

Connie Zotos (Drew University): I urge the defeat of this motion. I, like Linda, am concerned about the Division I philosophy; that's why I left Division I and came to Division III. I do believe that the nontraditional season should be modified, or maybe eliminated, but I think this legislation is wrong. It's not going to help that much with the training staff. It's not going to help that much with facilities when people continue to practice. The assumption that they won't, I think is erroneous.

There is one other piece that I'm really concerned about as an administrator, and that's the piece of assessment. Any time we educate, any time we instruct, we know that assessment is imperative. Although you can somewhat assess athletes' progress and the ability of the coaching staff in practice, there is no assessment that is as telling as competition with outside competition. I think everybody knows that. We're telling athletes that we will teach you for three weeks, four weeks, five weeks—whatever you do—but we will not give you one opportunity to see and for us to see as coaches how well you've learned. And I have a real problem with that. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you. In order to help move the discussion along, I'd ask the delegates to keep their comments as brief and direct as possible.

Sheila Wallace-Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): Two observations. I wanted to add to something my colleague Tim Gleason was saying. We've gotten into a little bit of a Burger King mentality where we all want to have it our way. None of us support the fact that if we want to have individual autonomy at our member institutions, we can save a lot of money and put it toward the nontraditional season. I think the legislation is important.

To the students, I would simply like to give you an observation. I come from a conference that does not allow any form of a nontraditional season. Two years ago, we asked our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee if they were interested in this, and they voted unanimously that they did not want any type of nontraditional season. It was unanimous, 16 members. Now we have some students new on the committee who are now bringing it forward and would like some form of a nontraditional season. I contend that students have wonderful ideas, but by virtue of the transient nature of students, that changes. I think we want to listen to those ideas, but I think we have to realize that those ideas are changing.

Gloria Scott (Bennett College): As a member of the Presidents

Council, I have three points to make. I would like to begin with number one. I come from the South. We're talking about the makeup of Division III. There are only two students from the South who are on the SAAC committee. This has been consistently true. We also surveyed students in the South. In some of the smaller schools, there are representative of Division III versus the schools that might need to be in Division I. The need for looking at what's what and the student-athlete is very critical. It is difficult to speak on behalf of all 127,000 students, a large number who are in the South but not represented by your presence on the board from the various colleges that are representative.

Number two, I want to say that this issue today and this vote puts on the table for us next year, or sometime in the near future, the real essence of the question about Division III and student athletics, and athletics and sports entertainment in this country and the role to be played in colleges and universities. Is it truly a student-athlete development process, or a money-maker for the institution or whatever?

So it seems in this kind of a discussion that we really do need to have it be open and comprehensive. Division III's purpose and its integrity faction is that the student-athlete across the board, large numbers, not individuals, are the ones to be touched. I strongly support and suggest that we all do.

Leon Lunder (Carlton College): I want to thank the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee for helping us clear away the small screen called the nontraditional season. They indicated that competition is good. They are indicating that more competition is better. Thus, what we have is not a nontraditional season but an expanded season. They are trying to truly develop a 21-week season in which they both compete and practice.

I think it's ironic that the NCAA was formulated to control inter-collegiate football, yet if you look in the Manual, football has 21 weeks of a season. But if you count back from the championship and you also count back, including the number of days countable prior to first competition, there are not 21 weeks in existence. Those student-athletes have no nontraditional season.

For some reason, that was a good idea; but for all the others, it wasn't a good idea. Do we want to expand the seasons? If we do want to expand them, then I would say vote against this legislation. If you are in favor of controlling the growth and expansion of seasons, other specialization, then the idea is to vote for this to restrict the competitive part at least of the process. I think we have to really clearly look at ourselves. When we talk about this, we better start talking about all student-athletes, including those student-athletes who play the game of football. (Applause)

John Carmody (Johnson and Wales University): I frankly think that exchanging druthers isn't going to change anyone's mind and the issue is one of technology rather than syntax at this point. Having

attended the American Baseball Coaches Association convention earlier this weekend in Chicago, I know of their concern with Prop 55.

Institutional methods of control in the nontraditional segment practices at our level, for now at least, can achieve the same purpose as Prop 55. In fact, if we polled most baseball coaches, they probably would tell you that they'd be getting the maximum 90 days that they normally would be playing in nontraditional competition.

My trainer assures me that her responsibilities will not be lessened and probably would increase by the elimination of nontraditional competition because of that. Quality care of our student-athletes is certainly a matter of institutional control.

Prop 55 doesn't address limits on practice opportunities or facility or personnel problems, which seem to be at the heart of the matter for the Presidents Council. We have been asked to compromise. We have not been asked to prove a solution. We may all agree that there is a need to change the structure of nontraditional seasons and competition, but Prop 55 is not the answer. (Applause)

John Galaris (Salem State College): At this point, I really haven't learned anything that I didn't know before I came here. I'm sure all of my colleagues know the issues involved around this for all our institutions. What strikes me today is that we have a split decision. People come together trying to move forward. We're really unable to do that very well because one side prevails over the other. The first thing we have to do as an Association is be satisfied. I would suggest that we table this motion for further study so we can come back next year with something that would be more agreeable to us. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you for that suggestion; however, NCAA bylaws for the management of the Convention do not allow for tabling.

Doug Weiss (California State University, Hayward): I think one issue hasn't been addressed so far and that's the amount of time that is being spent on campuses for the nontraditional season. I'm assuming that very similar to campuses on the West Coast, that people are playing somewhere between four and five weeks in the nontraditional season, leaving 16 or 17 weeks for the traditional season.

In a quarter-system school, if you're using five weeks as a maximum, that's 50 percent of the quarter still left without participation. In a semester school, that's 40 percent of the time the student-athlete is spending in the nontraditional season with 60 percent of the semester left to his or her dispense. I think this is an important issue that has not been addressed, so I urge your support in the defeat of Prop 55.

Todd Hutton (Utica College): I stand before you today feeling considerable ambiguity about this proposal. While I strongly support it, I regret that the issue could not be considered in a more wholistic manner. I would urge that we need to evaluate the nontraditional season of the length of play during the traditional seasons.

I strongly support student participation. But I'm also concerned and I fear that we are ignoring other students' needs. For example, we're ignoring the need for students to work 10 and 20 hours a week many times. We are ignoring the need for students to engage in cocurricular activities. We are ignoring the need for students to develop as whole individuals. The latter goal is an objective of each one of our institutions.

I would vote for this proposal, even though I understand the views of those opposing it. I understand the need of my colleagues in the Empire Athletic Association that strongly oppose this legislation. I would also strongly advocate for a reevaluation next year of both the nontraditional and traditional seasons. I would support, for example, a policy that permitted one or two contests during the nontraditional season.

I urge you to support this legislation, but I also urge you to ask the Presidents Council to reevaluate the regular and nontraditional seasons. Thank you.

Eric Dennis (Hood College): As an administrator, I look at myself as an educator. As an educator, I think my job is to provide more opportunity. I need more action between my great coaches/teachers and our student-athletes. Let's step up and let the coaches and student-athletes decide at their institution but, as we do at Hood College, protect those student-athletes who decide not to participate in nontraditional seasons. There would be a strain on facilities I heard somebody say. Would we rather have facilities empty?

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I've heard a number of comments. I think there are a number of us who are opposed to 55 who are in favor of some kind of regulation but it should include numbers of practice opportunities or reduced competition. The thought that I'm hearing is that if you're against 55, you've got to be for the full-blown maximum competitions and nontraditional seasons. I don't think that's true.

I think there are many of us who could support a more reasonable piece of legislation that had a number of—say 25 or 30—practice opportunities and two or three or four or five—you pick the number—contests that this does not address. I have respect for those who say zero is the right number, as someone just did. But there are many of us who are not at the poles, who are somewhere in the middle, and can support something in between those two. This is not, in my opinion, something in between those two that serves our student-athletes, serves our coaches, serves the reserves on the teams who finally get a chance to play and the spring seasons of a sport like volleyball.

So while we could support the nontraditional-season legislation, which is more restrictive than what we have now, this does not appear to be a piece that many of us expected. Many of us expected something to come forward to reduce the numbers of dates, reduce the number of competitions, and could have supported that. I just don't think this is the piece. I don't think it was well thought out. I

don't think there was any discussion with the groups that it affects. I'm the chair of the Golf Committee; there was no discussion.

The example was made about why we didn't bring forth legislation. The only people who could bring forth legislation after the amendment date when we saw this was the Presidents Council. We're restricted from bringing forth legislation. The only reason we had the amendment-to-the-amendment we had was because the Presidents Council is the only one who could propose something at this late date. Otherwise, we would have proposed something, which perhaps would have been more reasonable. We're prohibited from doing that. We can only deal with what is brought forward.

I don't think it's a good piece. I've listened to the student-athletes and again, we have said let's listen to them. All right, let's try to listen to them. Let's bring back, as we said for golf and tennis, a more reasonable proposal next year. Let's bring back a more reasonable proposal for everything. (Applause)

John Galaris (Salem State University): For all the reasons I stated before, I'd like to have a vote to refer this back to the committee, please.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Is there a second for the motion to refer? There is a motion and a second. I need a clarification. I assume that by "refer," you mean back to the Presidents Council. Just nod your head or wave, John.

This is a debatable motion. It requires majority vote, and we will vote by paddle when we need to do this. So now the microphones are open on the motion to refer to the Presidents Council. I don't see any speakers, so therefore we'll vote on the motion to refer by paddle. All those in favor of referring this motion back to the Presidents Council, please raise your paddle. All those opposed, please raise your paddle. Abstain.

It's too close to call. It's an important vote for both sides on this, so we're going to need to count. We're ready to vote on the motion to refer to the Presidents Council. The majority prevails. We have our counters ready. I'm going to ask you to raise your paddle and hold your paddles until our counters have had an opportunity to count each of their sections. Hold your paddles up until we ask you to drop them.

All those in favor of motion to refer, please raise your paddles. All those opposed, please raise your paddles. All those who would like to abstain, please raise your paddles.

Can I have your attention while we read the results of the vote to refer? Those in favor of referral 192, those opposed 143, and one abstention. The motion to refer has been adopted. So that dispenses our voting on 55-1.

Are there any other proposals that someone would like to move for reconsideration? If not, we will end this session of voting. Before I sit down, I want to thank you very much for your patience and cooperation. This obviously is a difficult issue. I feel that the discus-

sion was very constructive, healthy and very spirited. We all gained by listening to the comments. I will now pass the microphone back to President Die. Thank you. (Applause)

Ms. Die: I, too, want to thank you for your very careful attention during long discussions, for a thorough discussion and the civility with which those discussions were conducted. I appreciate that and I know that next year we'll have other proposals, some of which may involve issues that we've heard already today, some of which involve paths that we've heard already this morning and this afternoon. So again, thank you.

We are now ready for the afternoon discussion sessions. Would the panelists for our next discussion session please join the dais? Our first session deals with gender and ethnic diversity in Division III. As you heard this morning, diversity is an important focus of the Division III strategic plan. There remains much work to do throughout the NCAA related to this topic.

The public discussion of this topic often focuses on our colleagues in Division I. As you will hear, however, our division has its own unique set of issues and challenges to address related to diversity. Most importantly, these challenges exist not only at the national level, but at the conference and campus levels as well.

To begin our discussion, I would like to introduce Linda Moulton, director of athletics at Clark University. Linda's NCAA involvement has to do with terms on the former Division III Steering Committee and Management Council. She currently serves on the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics. Linda.

GENDER AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY DISCUSSION

Linda Moulton (Clark University): Good afternoon. I'm director of athletics at Clark University and a member of the NCAA Committee on Women's Athletics. At the request of the Division III Management and Presidents Councils, this session is devoted to discussing a topic that is extremely important to all of us on campuses: gender and ethnic diversity. The value and importance of providing a diverse environment has very positive implications for everyone who steps onto the campus—from the administration, the faculty, the supporters, parents and the most important constituents, the students.

During our time this afternoon, it is the hope of the panelists and me that we share specific ideas and strategies that you can take back and implement on your campus. Yesterday, we all had the opportunity to vote in support of enhancing the Association's nondiscrimination policy. The membership voted unanimously to support this change in the constitution. The national office has initiatives to increase diversity through the hiring of new staff and the promotion and retention of current staff, and has achieved significant results but continues to strive for improvement. We would encourage Division III to make a single commitment to that of the national office, to

develop goals and initiatives to increase gender and ethnic diversity. Today our goal is to provide to you information and strategies that will be valuable and useful and help you achieve success.

On the dais with me today are the following individuals: Dr. Gloria Scott, president of Bennett College, who will provide why institutions should address gender and diversity issues; David Caputo, president of Hunter College and also a member of the Committee on Women's Athletics, who will address the challenges and opportunities for Division III campuses; Eugene Marshall Jr., director of athletics, Ramapo College, and a member of the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, who will discuss the importance of role modeling beginning with women and minorities; and our last panelist, Cela Ocegueda, former student-athlete at the University of California, San Diego, and a current graduate student at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and a member of the National Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, who will give the student-athlete perspective.

At the end of Cela's comments, there will be time for questions and comments. First, I would like to set the stage and provide you with data depicting the status of NCAA Division III. This information has been provided in a packet with a yellow cover. We have a series of slides, and you can refer to the information in your packet.

The first slide will take a look at the national office with regard to its directives in diversity from the level of the president to the director level. At the level of president, the national office has one white male. At the level of senior vice president, out of the three positions, there are no females, one minority male, and two white males. At the vice-presidential chief of staff level, there is one minority female, three white females, one minority male, and seven white males. At the director level, there are five minority females, 11 white females, two minority males, and 20 white males.

Let's look at our second slide. It is also important that we look at the gender and ethnic diversity of Division III committees. As of the fall of 1999, for all Division III committees, there are 215 members of which there are 114 males and 100 females, of which there are only 21 minority committee members.

The third slide. At the level of director of athletics, 71 percent of the directors are white males; 24 percent are white females; 4 percent are minority males; 1 percent is minority females; 75 percent of the total are males; 25 percent of the total are females.

Our next slide shows that the gender and race demographics for the senior woman administrator is 100 percent female and only 6.2 percent minority females.

Let's look at our last slide. Of our faculty athletic representatives, 67 percent are white males; 28 percent are white females; 4 percent are minority males; 1 percent represent minority females; 72 percent out of the total are males; and 28 percent out of the total are females.

As you can see, we have some work to do. At this time, it gives me great pleasure to present Dr. Gloria Scott, president of Bennett College, to address gender and ethnic diversity.

Gloria Scott (Bennett College): As Linda said, I'm president of Bennett College for Women, a great school in North Carolina, a Division III member. For human and social reasons, whenever we consider issues of gender and ethnic diversity and the intersection of those issues, we are uneasy. A paradigm for our consideration this afternoon is one put forth by Harland Cleveland in his book "The Knowledge Executive," which I would like to use. He identifies the fact that there are always at least three sides to every issue: The way one person or group sees it, the way a second group or person sees it, and the way it is.

Our reason for exploring gender and equity issues is to try and move in to see it and respond to it on the way it is, to bring clarity to the way it is perceived and the way it is. Linda has shared with us some data representative of gender and ethnicity in Division III. Our problem is clear. The question is: What are we going to do about it? How do we move to realize the goal of true ethnicity and gender diversity in Division III and encourage it in Divisions I and II.

As a first step, the NCAA Executive Committee did establish the Subcommittee on Gender and Ethnicity as a permanent committee as a result of earlier meetings of the two committees and their recommendation that they become a permanent entity. The subcommittee consists of presidents, and its mission is to address issues surrounding gender and ethnicity within our membership. The Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee and the Committee on Women's Athletics have been given the charge to work with the subcommittee to develop and report issues, to propose solutions, and to monitor progress as it relates to creating equity and access for women and ethnic minorities.

We, the members of Division III, who base our philosophical being on the concept of equity and evenness and fairness for our student-athletes for whom we serve, must construct strategies to address our diversity issues and to be major players in achieving this equity and diversity among our ranks. It is not going to happen by merely thinking about it, talking about it, collecting data nor will it happen by withdrawing from it and hoping it will go away, or even moving around it. It will only happen when the trustees of institutions—the presidents, athletic directors, coaches, faculty and students—stop talking about the issue, especially those persons with the power to make a difference—the presidents, the athletic directors and the coaches—and begin to take action. The NCAA also needs to allocate adequate resources to make it happen.

We have that opportunity, as we move into the new contracts producing revenue coming into the Association, to in fact provide resources to make this happen. It is within our power to create a positive change. Today, we hope that you will listen very carefully as the

program is presented for you to use on your campuses to be beneficial. I encourage you not only to listen, but to engage in spirited dialogue to begin to implement these initiatives that would create a positive change.

David Caputo (Hunter College): I'm pleased to be here today. I was disappointed, as I'm sure all of you were, when Reverend Jackson was not able to be with us last evening. I fully expected by now that you would all be standing in the aisle screaming for diversity after he had energized us. I'll try—and I certainly cannot stand in for him—but I want to try to encourage, especially the presidents in the audience, to continue and remind them that it is very important for them to continue to discuss diversity.

The second thing I want to try to do today is give you an example or two that we have used at Hunter College, which I think may help some of us in the things that you're doing.

Before I begin, I'd like to tell a story. There was an individual who was given a parrot as a gift. The only problem with the bird is that it knew only obscenities. So for the owner, every time the bird was out, it created problems because it offended everybody. One day, the parrot was especially obnoxious. After swearing up a blue streak in front of some distinguished visitors, the owner said to the bird: "Now, under no conditions can this behavior be tolerated. You have to learn to modify your behavior and this kind of language can't continue." The bird listened politely and then uttered an obscenity.

A few days later, a similar thing happened. Finally, the owner got so frustrated with this parrot that he picked the parrot up, opened the freezer compartment of the refrigerator and put him in the freezer. About 10 minutes later, he realized what he had done and he opened the door and the parrot came out. The parrot said to him: "You know, we need to talk." The owner said "yes." The parrot said: "I've been wrong. I'm going to reform. You need to know that I will never again utter an obscenity. But I have one question." The owner said "yes." The parrot said: "What did the chicken do?" (Laughter).

In getting into this topic, it's very important that as presidents we make sure that we keep it front and center to everyone on our campuses. If we do not keep it front and center, no one else will. So it is important that we do it in terms of our speeches, in terms of our public announcements. It's also very important that we make sure that it's in our strategic planning, that it's done. It's also important that it is done in a measurable, quantifiable way. It is not enough to espouse it. You need to push for results and insist upon results.

Second, I think it is very important to staff and students across the campus to know that the chief executive officer is, in fact, in favor and moving on this front.

Third, I would argue—Reverend Jackson could make a much stronger case than I can—that it is the morally correct thing to do. We must have staffs that are reflective of our student body and the society we all serve.

Finally, for our athletes, for our student-athletes, we need to have coaching and administrative role models who they can aspire to. It is a complicated issue. There are no easy answers.

I want to take just a few minutes to explain something we've done at Hunter. At Hunter, we treat recruitment for our coaches and for our administrative staff within the athletic affairs as part of the same process as we use for our faculty recruitment. Hunter is a very diverse university of about 20,000 students where 40 percent are white, 20 percent are African-American; 23 percent Hispanic; 15 percent Asian-American. We have a very complicated set of relationships on our campus, given our size and diversity, where we are 70 percent women, 28 percent men.

As I mentioned, we use the same system that we use when we recruit faculty or what we call our higher education officers series. That means that the affirmative action office and our affirmative action officers are involved in the process from the beginning. These are involved in a proactive way rather than the simply compatible figures and characteristics of those involved. I should point out to you that the affirmative action officer reports directly to the president, not to some other office on campus.

When athletics is in the process of recruiting, they have to go through a series of steps, as every other office has to in terms of the hiring process. This permits the affirmative action people to be involved in all steps. From the framing of the job description, to the way you write the job description and, in fact, include or exclude individuals, to the way you write an ad. Also, it can be very welcoming or it can be very dampening on individuals.

More importantly, as the process continues, the affirmative action officer has to both approve a pool of candidates before any interviews are done. If that pool does not include minorities and women, then in many cases we will either stop that search or force the search to continue with additional advertising. They'll also review final candidates who are brought in and the decision as to why candidates are not hired as well as why they are hired. The affirmative action officer has the authority to stop a search or require that it be done differently.

We've discontinued searches in some cases, not in athletics but in other departments, because the pool was not representative. We've said "no" to short lists, and we've also asked that the hiring recommendations be reviewed. Again, those are very controversial when you do it, yet once people realize that in fact the process is a process that's going to be honored, I think you'll find that people do a much better job.

How have we done in terms of the process? One of the things—and I'm sorry you really won't be able to see this—is that we have a checklist that is used. The checklist has to be filled out for each position. The way the checklist works is for the approval of the search plan has to be done, the approval of the advertising has to be done,

the affirmative action survey parts have to be sent back, a list of questions asked of each application. In fact, we require that as our applicants are interviewed, that a common set of questions are asked so there's not a chance for some applicants to be asked a different set depending on their gender or ethnicity. They also have to make sure the pools are properly numbered. This keeps our affirmative action officer quite busy.

In terms of results, according to the last set of statistics I have, just to give you some idea how difficult this process is, we are a very multicultural college sitting in a very multicultural city, although the location we have in the city is not multicultural; we're on the upper east side. But of an administrative staff of 10, four of whom are females, five of whom are minorities. In terms of the coaching staffs, out of 28 coaches, eight are women and 15 are minorities. If you combine the two, it means then we have 20 minorities out of 38 total. We have 26 males and 12 females.

Let me give you an example of what some of our pools of candidates look like. For instance, for a position for athletic facilities manager, we had 32 males apply, 10 women, and one-third of the applicants were minorities. For an assistant athletic director's position that also involved coaching, we had 22 males, 13 females, and over 40 percent of the applicants were minorities. Now, what are the lessons to be learned? There is certainly not one way to do it. But I think first of all, the most important thing, as was mentioned earlier, it's not going to just happen. It's only going to happen if you take purposeful action, if you have purposeful strategy.

Secondly, I would hope that the NCAA, I would hope Division III and I would hope the individual campuses must and can do everything possible to encourage women and minorities to get into the position to be hired. One of the reasons the numbers are so low—I think a member of the CWA committee said it's very clear—is that there are simply not enough women and minorities out there being recruited into entry-level, beginning-type positions in terms of internships and other things. The NCAA, Division III and campuses must do better.

Finally, I think it is very important that we encourage students to follow their dreams to get into coaching or to get into athletic administration. We must find opportunity. We must look at promotion possibilities from within. We must look to create ways to develop the talent that is out there. If we do not do that, it is not the woman or minority who is not hired who loses, it is in fact all of us who lose in terms of campus and in terms of our student-athletes.

So I would ask that when you have a moment to reflect on this that you think about what your campus could do to change the nature of your recruiting process and ultimately change the nature of recruiting.

Now, Eugene Marshall, who's the athletic director of Ramapo College, is going to be next.

Eugene Marshall (Ramapo College): Good afternoon.

Today I want to share with you the importance of being a role model and mentor. The primary efforts of role modeling and mentoring help guide and nurture athletic administrators for the future. We have several opportunities to serve as mentors to our students and student-athletes. Many of us do just that through our everyday activities in our professor and student relationship, the administrator/coach/ student-athlete relationship, through our internships, our fellowship programs, and also through our supervisory and subordinate relationships.

When we serve as role models for our students and student-athletes in our colleges and universities, we inspire them to embark on a career in coaching or athletic administration as well as athletic/academic support. We should be an example for role models, for those who are willing to follow in our footsteps. You have females and minority student-athletes interested in following athletic administration footsteps, but we need to have minorities and women be their leaders. We also need to strive to have a level playing field so the candidates who are in line for positions can be hired based on their abilities and not only their ethnicity. We need to get more people in the pipeline.

To give you an example, for the past 11 years as athletic director at three different institutions, I always hear people say that they want to look for minority candidates and that they couldn't find any. There was one person who they would always call on. He has great quality and he's probably moved quite a few people, minorities and others, to higher positions. He's Art Eason at William Paterson University. From Division I, II and III, we all pull ahead to find someone to fill the spot. I think it's time that we all take some of the burden off of Art Eason and get our own list of folks who we can spread around by word of mouth. If you look around this room today, it's not a diverse room. I think by 2010 this room should be very diverse.

Also, we need to have diversity among presidents and board of trustee members. I started to take a very proactive role in hiring minorities and women. The last three athletic directors have all been minorities in Brooklyn, New York. At the College of Staten Island, the past two athletic directors have been minorities. Maybe they're willing to take a chance. It's easy to talk about it.

It's easy to say you don't know anybody. But as coaches and former coaches, you've recruited minority student-athletes, male and female, to build your programs into very competitive teams. Somehow, once they graduate or once you become an administrator, you somehow lose the ability to go outside and recruit minority male and female candidates. I think we need to go back to what we did as coaches and go out and find the best candidates and go out and look a little further for minority males and females.

It's also important to have a diverse staff, because in athletics, you're dealing with a lot of diverse people. Having a diverse staff, you can better relate to the constituents who you deal with on a regular

basis. It also makes it easier to mentor your staff and bring them along so that they become familiar with your president, your vice-president, your trustee members. A diverse staff that becomes familiar with one another, has a sense of comfort so that when it comes time to hire someone you can hire someone they feel comfortable with. So these people you're now comfortable with, you can move them along and you won't have too much opposition.

In closing, I'd just like to say that this is the time that I think Division III needs to go to the forefront and really begin to look in your own back yards and start to really deal with this diversity issue. I think we need to see more academic faculty reps of color, I think we need to see more athletic directors and coaches and put them in meaningful positions. We also need to mentor them and guide them into situations that they can succeed in. A lot of times we're put in situations we can only take the position that we can fail in and that's not right. Everybody needs to have a chance to succeed. I will close by saying that role modeling is very key to this whole thing. It goes to your student-athletes and it also goes to your staff. The quicker you get started, the quicker this room will fill up. Thank you. (Applause)

Cela Ocegüera (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): Good afternoon. I'd like to thank all those responsible for allowing me to participate in the panel this afternoon. I'm very excited to be here. This topic is extremely important to me for obvious reasons. It's something I'm very passionate about. I'm here to give you the student-athlete perspective and general overview of all student-athletes, as well as some personal experiences I've had. I'm going to be discussing why it is absolutely necessary to strive for a diverse staff in intercollegiate athletics. There are three basic reasons for this. They are the student-athlete comfort level in building an intercollegiate athletic community; conflict resolution and prevention; as well as superior communication with student-athletes and their athletic departments.

I begin with this simple point. Student-athletes choose to attend a school they feel most comfortable with. Thus, if an athletic department wants to recruit and involve minority student-athletes, it is imperative that the department reflect these diverse cultures in their staff. I can't think of a more straightforward and simple way to say this.

As was mentioned earlier, Cedric Dempsey spoke about the NCAA's second 100 years and the commitment to student-athlete welfare. The membership unanimously agreed. Athletic departments can show their sincere interest in student-athletes by creating a comfort level for all members, including women and minorities. But because of the simple structure and athlete makeup of Division III institutions in particular, it is even more important to make the effort to create a comfortable environment for minority student-athletes at their institutions. Division III schools are often small, private and

not as ethnically diverse as public schools that are close by and larger. If student-athletes have fewer mentors academically or within the athletic administration, the intercollegiate athletic department must then accept the responsibility to make the extra effort.

I have been talking about the comfort level of the student-athlete, the community and the athletic department and it may seem somewhat impractical. However, conflicts can be better resolved and prevented when a student-athlete feels comfortable speaking with the department or the compliance director. This community building is all a part of the student-athlete seeing the intercollegiate athletic department as "we" and not "they" or "them." Oftentimes, the student-athlete might only see the athletic department as the ones who can take away their eligibility, the ones who get them in trouble. The more we can do to include the student-athlete with the athletic department, the more we can be able to work together and avoid problems.

Minority student-athletes and female student-athletes in the athletic department made up of men or people not of color are more apt to feel as if they are out of their element. There is no communication without this necessary comfort level. Questions won't be asked, information won't be asked for and problems that were avoidable may grow instead. Athletic departments need the ability to recognize issues and problems of student-athletes. They need to understand student-athlete perception and history, signs of struggling, signs of need for help. Many cultures do not take charge well with authority figures as they're not really brought up to question authority.

As for my personal experience at UCSD, there were two main things I'll be speaking about. One was a conflict I had with my coach and the second is my experience with the entire department as a whole. I come from a family where my father was born in Mexico, my mother in Canada, and myself in the United States. Some of my friends call me NAFTA. (Laughter) Because of this unique family situation, I have a lot of different cultures at home. Traditionally, my Hispanic family is closer. I see them more often.

My freshman year when I came to play UC San Diego soccer, my family wanted me home every time possible. I'm originally from Los Angeles, so that's about a two-hour drive. I was also practicing and playing for UCSD, so you can imagine the different physical and mental strains. My coach was able to understand this; however, I think it had a lot to do with the fact that my mother was able to speak with my father about moving on. However, this is something that people may not think about off the top of their head. I realize that some of them find themselves having to deal with other issues that are cultural and not just academic and just in sports.

As for my athletic department as a whole, I cannot express how influential they have been. I was able to feel very comfortable with my campus Student-Athlete Advisory Committee and with my de-

partment. I even interned there after graduating. This isn't just with me. There are a significant number of female interns at UCSD because of the number of women who are in the athletic department. I think this has everything to do with the fact that Judy Sweet, the only female president of the NCAA, helped run that before her retirement. Because of this, I felt comfortable to apply for my position on the national SAAC committee and that has influenced me to choose a career in athletics. Thus, I cannot explain how important role models are in an intercollegiate athletic department.

I have been asked to give some specific strategies and suggestions. While I believe sensitivity from coaches and an athletic department can create necessary awareness, the best way this can be achieved is by hiring qualified women and minorities. On a side note, I'll be graduating this May. (Laughter) Seriously, this is something that's very important to me. I do believe there are qualified female and minorities out there. Like I said earlier, hopefully you will all be able to influence others to get into this field. Thank you.

Linda Moulton (Clark University): I think that means that she has a stack of resumes down at the front of the table if anyone would be interested in picking one up after the presentation. I think before we ask if there are comments or suggestions or other things that you might share with us, I would point out in your packet that there is a wonderful minority opportunity equity plan that the University of Texas, El Paso, has put together. We thought it would be helpful to include this in your packet of information.

I know that we are pressed for time, given the fact that we have two other presentations this afternoon. But I do think that the sharing of information is helpful. We have four people up here who through their words, through their actions, and their passion and commitment to gender and ethnic diversity, have done wonderful things on their campuses and teams. I think we really want to set a tone for the things that all of us know we could be doing much better.

We also know there are a fair number of people in the audience who have strategies that you have used and been effective on your campuses. We would certainly like to ask your opinion if you would step up to the microphone and share some suggestions. Our thought is to be able to take away some very definitive tools with us that you can go back to your campuses and apply to some situations.

Kim Allen (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark): I would like to share some strategies that we use at Rutgers as far as gender and ethnic diversity. First, I think it's important to realize that our university is an incredibly diverse campus as well as community. Therefore, I think it's easier for us to attract and have the ability to retain minorities and women.

Rutgers publishes a handbook for affirmative action, "Equal Employment Opportunity Guidelines for Recruitment and Selection of Staff." The handbook outlines ways to attract and select members for athletic positions. A major requirement is to have a broad search

that will result in a representative applicant pool. The pool is one in which minorities and women are found in substantially the same proportion as males in the recruitment area, whether that recruitment area is on the local, statewide or national labor markets. Also, we do not allow preselection for any position. Our personnel office also plays a major role in recruiting applicants by making special efforts to create a pool of candidates that's broadly representative and results in an aggressive and resourceful search. I think that's probably one of the most important things. You need to have an aggressive and resourceful search.

In conjunction with personnel, the hiring department supplements the effort by contacting its own sources, including affirmative action sources, and this helps to ensure a large and representative pool from which this selection can be made. We also track the administrative levels across the university. If a search is opening on an administrative level, the affirmative action department will check to see if they are lacking diversity. If they are lacking diversity, it is a major priority to fill that position and that department will be notified that it is a major priority to fill that position with a minority or a woman.

Lastly, in all our advertising, we use sexually neutral language and indicate that Rutgers is an equal opportunity and affirmative action employer. If anyone is interested in taking a look at our handbook, please feel free to check with me at Rutgers.

Ms. Moulton: I'm sure that Kim will be more than willing if you'd like to contact her. She's at Rutgers University if you would like a copy of the information that she was referring to.

Valerie Cushman (Randolph-Macon Woman's College): I'm a member of the Division III Nominating Committee. I, too, would like to comment on campus success at our institution. We have placed many candidates in positions that we all benefit from.

It is our mission repeatedly on the Nominating Committee to place minority candidates on Division III committees. With all this hard work of the committee, it was still only able to place 10 percent of minority candidates on our Division III committees. I would ask you to assist us in this process by reading The NCAA News, with an eye for looking at the vacancies for persons on your campus—FARs, CEOs, coaches and athletic administrators, for minorities who may be interested in these positions. I think your support in urging them to apply for these positions will go a long way. It will increase our candidate pool and allow us to better represent all of the members in Division III. Thank you.

Sean Frazier (Manhattanville College): I would echo my colleagues and also like to talk about the search process. That is the key element that sometimes you forget, or we mistake that. In the search process, we need to put the search back into the process. A lot of times we send out notification of employment and we're told to forget about the search.

At Manhattanville, we've done a lot of active work in the area of recruiting and tracking qualified women and racial minorities to our campus. One of the unique things we've done is create a network of schools and conferences, almost like a consortium of schools, whereby we tap into the conferences and the schools themselves. So in case there is an opening, we go right to the conferences. We go right to the folks who are tapped into that.

One of the biggest knocks on hiring ethnic or women in positions is they're not qualified. I would argue that if you go out there and look and actively dig up and try to search out this kind of issue, you will see that there's an abundance of talent and opportunity out there. I think the biggest issue is that the level playing field has been shifted. As we see by the numbers, it's quite obvious that we have a lot of work to do. Implementation is the key. Resources are a key. Accountability and responsibility of the department heads from the top down, from presidents and athletic directors to make this happen, is the only way this is going to happen.

Once hired, keeping them is another aspect. Retention is the critical part. I think having a role model in place is a key. It's like having a network within your institution to retain. It's almost like a buddy system or mentoring, once these individuals do get to your campus. These are all key elements that have to be played out.

I had an opportunity that basically was going to integrate with other services that are at my institution to help recruit and retain ethnic minorities. There also is another way you can do this. You can grow your own. I've had great success in tapping into the student-athlete area where I've said, "If you want a fine career, you should get into intercollegiate athletics. This is a great career. How about you join the team?"

These are all areas that diversify your departments from within. These are all things that haven't been thought up overnight; it's things we've planned and researched. If there's any way I can help you out with that, I would be glad to do that.

Mike Gentile (Empire Athletic Association): I've been involved in Division III athletics for about 10 days. Prior to that, I spent about 10 years in Division I athletics. I was kind of surprised to see the University of Texas, El Paso, minority equity plan in here because before I left El Paso, Texas, I had a large part directing this. Fortunately, one of the good aspects of being a Division I administrator is that I was involved in drafting both gender and minority in two areas of teaching, one in Buffalo, New York, and one in El Paso, Texas. I'd just like to point out a few things.

If you do draft one, the first thing I want to tell you is to research the demographics of your community and your campus, because a minority is not necessarily a minority. If you look at the first page of the UTEP plan, you see that. It becomes important to look and make sure you're compliant with the plan because if you use demographics, then it becomes more of a benefit to your students and your student-

athlete population in general.

The second thing I would ask you to do is assess and evaluate your plan. Make sure that you really work the plan. A lot of times you end up developing a plan because somebody tells you to. It kind of defeats the purpose. So please, do it for the right reason and then put it into effect.

Once you do have a plan, don't leave it solely up to the human resource people to put it into effect for you. The people who become involved in your program as coaches and administrators have an interest in your athletes. They're people who are going to be involved with them from day to day. You want to make sure that they can have the best possible experience they can.

Laura Beck (Lewis and Clark College): I want to thank the panel for its hard and important work. The one thing that seems to be missing in our discussion is the reflection of gay and lesbian athletes and administrative staff. It seems to me that it's a kind of don't ask/don't tell policy at the NCAA when, in fact, many of our athletes, staff and faculty are gay and lesbian. When you are just discovering that aspect of your life, a student-athlete's life can be full of turmoil, and for some people, even shame. I would like to ask the panel if this has come up in your discussion. What does the NCAA do in terms of nurturing the gay or lesbian student-athlete?

Ms. Moulton: I'm not sure I can answer that for you completely because the panelists themselves come from varied backgrounds. But I will say that on the Committee on Women's Athletics, and I think David would echo this, certainly it is something that we have talked about. It is very much a part of what we ensured in that policy on nondiscrimination that was passed yesterday. For a long time, we felt that was one of the issues that was really sort of hanging up the fact that the Association could not vote on something as inclusive as we felt needed to be.

So we do feel that while it's an important step, it's only the first step. So I can only say to you that our committee, and I'm sure that the Minority Opportunities and Interests Committee, will be looking at this issue. I think that gives specific answers for you about strategies.

But your point is well made and we will certainly make sure that it does get addressed. I think if you have some specific strategies, things that you would like to share with either of those committees, but particularly the Committee on Women's Athletics, we would hope that you would feel free to do that.

Cela Ocegüera (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee): I'd like to thank you for bringing that up and apologize for not looking over that. However, this poll was basically for minorities and women; that was the focus. From a student-athlete perspective, it is basically what I reiterated earlier—athletic departments can show a sincere interest in student-athletes by creating a comfort level for all members. I said to include women and minorities. I should have added

people with different sexual preferences.

Ms. Moulton: We understand that the Presidents Council has, in fact, requested that the Division III membership establish a committee that will look at this issue or come up with a plan to address gender and ethnic diversity. Is that correct? I want to make sure I'm saying the right thing. So you certainly will be hearing much more about this. We want to raise your level of awareness. There are many people around the room who you should feel free to talk to to get questions answered and advice on strategies that you can use.

Thank you for your patience. At this time, I'll turn the microphone back to President Die. Thank you all very much. (Applause)

Ms. Die: Thank you very much, Linda, and the rest of the panel members also. I also want to thank those who are members in the audience who came to the microphones to talk with us. I'm sure this session will help our members and our governance structure.

I know it has been a long day. I know you've given careful discussion and thought to many issues. We have two very important panel presentations left, one on deregulation and one on amateurism. We want to give them as much time as possible because they put in a great deal of preparation for the presentations. We will take a 10-minute stretch break. We will reconvene at 3:35.

[Note: A recess was taken from 3:25 to 3:35 p.m.]

DEREGULATION DISCUSSION

Ms. Die: Our panel is getting ready to begin. Would you please take your seats? Thank you for returning to your seats.

Our next session will focus on the ongoing deregulation of the Division III Manual. This is another important priority identified in our strategic plan. With the implementation of the federated governance structure, our division now has the ability to make the Manual reflect more directly what is really important to our division and consistent with our philosophy. I should note that Divisions II and I are focusing on deregulation as well. Our Interpretations and Legislation Committee has coordinated this effort. Members of that committee are here to update you on the work that has been accomplished, which is substantial, as well as to review the work that remains. Leading our discussion will be Suzanne Coffey, director of athletics at Bates College and chair of the Interpretations Committee. Suzanne. (Applause)

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): Thank you, President Die. Good afternoon.

It's my pleasure to welcome you to the Division III forum on deregulation. I hope this forum will give you a sense of what the Interpretations and Legislation Committee has already accomplished in Divisions I and II, as well as a sense of what lies ahead in the deregulation process.

I would like to introduce my colleagues on the Division III ILC. They are Stephen Argo, commissioner of the Southern Collegiate Ath-

letic Conference; Lon Boike, athletic director at Clarke College; Carlyle Carter, executive director of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Susan Chapman, athletics director at Worcester State College; and Elizabeth Sander, former student-athlete at Bryn Mawr College. Beverly Klooster, faculty athletic representative from Calvin College, is also a member of the committee but is not able to be with us today. Lon Boike and Libby Sander will begin our program this afternoon by explaining the work that the committee has already accomplished. Lon.

Lon Boike (Clarke College): Thank you, Suzanne. As part of its strategic plan, the committee was charged with the task of deregulating Bylaws 10 through 17. This process began in June 1998 and continues with the presentation of the committee's work thus far at this Convention. The committee formed a philosophical premise to its deregulation efforts prior to starting Phase II. The premise was based on two questions: One, is the legislation relevant to Division III; and two, is the legislation consistent with the Division III philosophy? If the committee answered "no" to either of these questions, the specific piece of legislation was closely examined for possible elimination. It was with these two questions in mind that the committee went about its work.

Libby Sander will now explain the two phases of deregulation work.

Libby Sander (Interpretations and Legislation Committee): Thank you, Lon. The deregulation process was broken down into two phases. Phase I focused on two ideals: the elimination of legislation that was adopted in the old governance structure in response to Division I and II needs; and the desire to make the Division III Manual specific to Division III, eliminating references to Divisions I and II where applicable. This work was completed and submitted to the Management Council in July of 1998.

Phase II of the deregulation process focused on three ideals: clarification and simplification of the Manual; elimination of legislation that is irrelevant to Division III; and elimination of legislation that is inconsistent with Division III philosophy. This work was completed and submitted to the Management Council in July of 1999. These revisions were placed in one of three categories: staff editorial revisions; Management Council revisions; and substantive revisions, Proposals 59 through 79.

Carlyle Carter will now briefly review the deregulation package to be voted on tomorrow morning.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Thanks, Libby.

Staff editorial revisions recommended by the committee were considered to be minor and editorial in nature. Examples of these revisions include changing the title in Bylaw 13.6.1 from "General Restrictions" to "General Regulations," consistent with similar titles, and changing all references to the "NCAA championship" in Bylaw 17

to "NCAA Division III championship" where possible.

The next category of changes in Phase II are the Management Council editorial revisions. These revisions were approved this morning when Appendix F of the blue pages of the Official Notice was formally approved. The committee does not believe that these revisions changed the scope of the current legislation.

The final category of Phase II revisions are the substantive revisions contained in Proposals 59 through 79. These are revisions that change the scope of the current legislation. Let's examine two of these proposals—Proposals No. 71 and No. 73. Proposal No. 71 deletes the nonpermissible list set forth in several sections of Bylaw 16. This proposal removes several bylaws that set forth awards or benefits that cannot be financed by an institution. The committee agreed that the list of permissible awards and benefits that may be financed by an institution is exhausting. Therefore, if an activity or award is not listed on the permissible list, it is not permissible.

Another example of a substantive revision is Proposal No. 73, which also deals with benefits for student-athletes. This proposal, which amends Bylaw 16.3 and 16.5, is intended to permit institutions to provide benefits to student-athletes only if such benefits are provided to students in general. This is consistent with the Division III philosophy that student-athletes should not be treated differently than students in general. Consistent with that philosophy, these revisions will clarify legislation that permits institutions to provide academic support services to student-athletes as provided to students in general.

All these revisions were reviewed and supported by the Presidents and Management Councils. Suzanne will now explain to you what lies ahead for the committee's deregulation efforts.

Ms. Coffey: Thank you, Carlyle. The 2000 Convention was the end point of Phases I and II, but certainly not the end of the committee's deregulation efforts. The committee will shift its focus from legislative changes, such as the proposal before you tomorrow, to the format of the Division III Manual. Division III format issues will be the committee's main focus in the next year or two. The committee has identified four key format issues that will eventually lead to the creation of a true Division III Manual.

The first issue is the creation of a glossary of terms with definitions. In various places in the Manual, specific words are defined but often those definitions are confusing or a contradictory definition of the same word is elsewhere in the Manual. The committee hopes to create an easy-to-find, easy-to-read glossary of terms that includes these definitions. An example of such a glossary entry is shown on the next slide. The committee hopes that such a glossary would make commonly used NCAA words or phrases, such as *student-athlete* or *practice* or *contest*, etc., easier to find and easier to understand.

The second Manual format issue is the modification of bylaw numbering and/or sequencing. During its review of Bylaws 10 to 17,

the committee noted numerous pitfalls with the bylaw format. Two examples are found in Bylaw 13 and Bylaw 17. In Bylaw 13, all of the legislation relating to transportation for official visits is contained in the transportation section, for example, as opposed to being in the official visit section, the most logical place for such legislation.

In Bylaw 17, there is very little consistency with regard to the particular bylaws. The committee agreed that it would be helpful to use a legislative template in this bylaw. Using this template, for instance, Bylaw 17-point-the sport ID number-point-one would always be the length of playing season. Bylaw 17-point-the sport identification number-point-two would always be preseason practice and so on. This is not currently the case.

The third Manual format issue is the addition of key references and cross references to various bylaws. Sometimes it's more important to review several different pieces of legislation applicable to a particular situation. The committee hopes to add those key references to the legislation itself. For example, when determining whether a student-athlete has any seasons of competition remaining, it's helpful to review the minimum criteria when using a season of competition found in 14.2.4.1. The committee hopes that these additions would make it easier to understand this and other legislation.

The final Manual format issue is bylaw language or semantics. Currently, the Manual language is very inconsistent. For example, as shown on this slide, here are consecutive bylaws that use different language; 13.11.6 uses the negative language while 13.11.7 uses the positive language. Consistent language would make the Manual easier to understand. The end result of the completion of all of these issues is the creation of a true Division III Manual.

As the committee works toward this ultimate goal, it faces several challenges. The first of these challenges is the role of technology. How would technology affect the Division III membership from a legislative standpoint? One of the concepts being considered is the placement of the Manual on CD Rom. This would enable the membership to use computer technology to access the Division III Manual. Another concept being considered is the availability of the Manuals on the NCAA Web site. This would permit institutions to review any of the three Manuals via the Internet.

The second challenge facing the committee is the Manual gap issue. You may have noticed that in some places within the Manual, you may have Bylaw 13.4, for example, followed by 13.4.2 or 13.6. The gap in between these bylaws indicates that Division I or II has a division-specific bylaw that does not apply to Division III; thus, a Manual "gap" is created. Each division is working on eliminating all of these gaps. However, there may be several Association-wide bylaws that will remain, such as 13.4 being recruiting materials in all three divisions.

The elimination of these gaps creates several challenges. One such problem is the concept of a different bylaw in each Manual all

having the same bylaw citation. For example, 14.2 of Division I may be different than in Division II and may be different still in Division III. But what does this mean for our membership? The voting lines in the Manual, if our committee's actions go forward, would be removed as all of the Division III Manual would contain the legislation that applies directly to Division III.

Another challenge faced by the committee is the creation of a federated legislative database. Currently, there is only one legislative database that contains rules interpretations and legislative assistance columns for all three divisions. Plans are underway to create separate legislative databases for each division. The NCAA staff, with help from this committee, will be asked to review all interpretations to determine which divisions they apply to. This will ensure that division-specific databases will be created.

The fourth challenge facing the committee is the creation of a multidivision reference vehicle. If each of the divisions creates its own Manual and eliminates the gaps, as I've mentioned earlier, bylaws in all three divisions could indeed be different. This would necessitate the creation of a multidivision reference vehicle that includes legislation from all three divisions. How this vehicle will be implemented is still undetermined; however, it will be a key part in our legislative future.

Now that we've reviewed the challenges we're facing, let's review a projected time line of when these challenges will be overcome. With work currently underway by the NCAA staff, it's projected that a federated legislative database could be implemented by August of 2000. Also in August of 2000, the issues revolving around the Manual gaps should be completed. The final two challenges are projected to be completed by January 2001—the federated legislative database and the multidivision reference vehicle. We hope that a year from now we will be able to provide you with an update of each of these tasks, much like we've done over the last two years with Phases I and II of deregulation.

In closing, I'd like to thank you for attending and for staying with us this afternoon. I would also like to thank the members of the committee for their tireless efforts over the last two years. I would like to especially recognize Carlyle Carter and Libby Sander, our two departing committee members, for their valuable assistance in this project. Both of you will be greatly missed. (Applause)

At this point, the committee would be happy to entertain any questions that may have arisen during this session. Thank you very much.

Ms. Die: Our thanks to the Interpretations and Legislation Committee for its careful efforts. We can all benefit from a Division III Manual that more directly reflects our philosophy and is more user-friendly. I know your work is not always easy, but it has been a great value thus far to our membership. We look forward to hearing from you and hearing of your future efforts.

Would the designated members of the Amateurism Task Force please join the dais? We're having a couple of technical difficulties, but these apparently can be taken care of. You can go ahead and turn to the next-to-last page of your yellow packet. You'll see the agenda and there's a handout on the last page. Our visuals are coming; they're just not quite here yet.

I think you will find this next discussion topic both interesting and challenging, so I encourage you to pay attention as well as to keep an open mind. Last summer, we learned that Divisions I and II had begun a comprehensive review of the amateurism regulations applicable in those divisions. The Division III Management and Presidents Councils agree that such an effort was appropriate for our division as well, since it presented an opportunity for greater deregulation as well as address important issues of student-athlete welfare. We therefore added the issue to our strategic plan and created a task force to tackle this issue head on. Chairing the task force is Tom Weingartner, director of athletics at the University of Chicago. Tom has had extensive experience dealing with these issues on the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee. He also has had a unique opportunity to serve as Division III liaison to the amateurism review efforts underway in Divisions I and II. Tom will lead our discussion this afternoon. Tom. (Applause)

AMATEURISM TASK FORCE DISCUSSION

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): Thank you, President Die. We're down to the committed few, and we appreciate your patience. We will try to be brief and interesting. I'm joined on the dais by other members of the task force. I want to introduce them to you: JoAnn Andregg, associate director of athletics, University of St. Thomas; Steve Erber, director of athletics at Muhlenberg College; Sarah Hatgas, head tennis coach at Rhodes College; Lee Pelton, president of Willamette University; and Les Poolman, athletics director at Dickinson College. Also on the task force is Melissa Kelly, who couldn't be with us today. She is a student-athlete representative from Hood College; Katherine Keough, president of St. John Fisher College; and Randy Town, head baseball coach at Claremont Mudd-Scripps College.

We have an ambitious agenda in introducing the issue of amateurism to the Division III membership. We not only want to acquaint you with members of the task force, but to talk about several issues. First, the rationale for the task force's existence; secondly, the task force's time line; thirdly, the history of amateurism; fourth, the task force's core values; five, identify Division III problems; six, Division III amateurism precedence on amateurism and scenarios; and finally, we hope to open the floor to questions if we have time.

It warrants mentioning that this task force has only met once thus far and needs your feedback, comments and expressions of concern at the end of this session. H. L. Langman once said that for

every complex problem, there is a simple solution, and it is always wrong. We want to steer clear of eventually recommending the wrong solutions to any problems that we might identify with amateurism. So please be prepared to ask some questions at the end or we'll have to start calling on people.

Before we start, I want to emphasize that the task force has only considered the issue of amateurism as it relates to preenrollment—that is to say prospective students before they enroll in college. That is also true for the Division I and II task forces on amateurism. At some later date, we will return for discussion of amateurism rules for enrolled college students and determine if there is any need to change. Again, today's discussion addresses only amateurism rules for athletes before they enroll in college. That's important to remember.

The task force owes its existence essentially to three origins. The NCAA Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee has for a number of years struggled with the existing NCAA amateurism rules, and with overly harsh, inconsistent sanctions it has been required to impose on some student-athletes. Secondly, Ced Dempsey has established as one of his key initiatives the deregulation of NCAA rules in an effort to enhance student welfare. I applaud the great work that the Deregulation Committee has done. In part, this effort grows out of that deregulation effort.

Finally, both Division I and II have formed similar task forces and are contemplating perhaps radical changes to their division amateurism rules. So in order to anticipate and respond to the possible changes in amateurism rules at the Division I and II level, and also to review our current rules regarding amateurism from a perspective of both student-athlete welfare and deregulation, this task force has done its work to think broadly about amateurism issues.

Regarding our work in the coming months, in July of '99, the Management Council approved a two-year time frame for the task force to complete its work. Consequently, we don't anticipate bringing forth to the membership possible legislative proposals until the Convention in 2002, with further discussion anticipated for the 2001 Convention.

On the screen, you will see four points regarding the history of amateurism. They are provided simply to suggest that the NCAA has struggled with this issue ever since its inception, never fully getting our arms around the problem. The first slide addresses the difficulty of imposing sanctions regarding violations of amateurism that allows even then for quote, technical, unintentional, or youthful infractions of a rule. These kinds of technical and unintentional infractions are precisely the kinds of violations we most often see on the Committee for Student-Athlete Reinstatement.

The second slide draws our attention to the interesting origins of amateurism, which has its roots in the elitist English notion of class. The version at that time allowed the common working man to par-

ticipate in what was then an upper-class and gentile pursuit of competitive sport.

The third slide highlights Major Griffith's remarks at the 1925 Convention, suggesting just how difficult the issue of amateurism was and continues to be.

Finally, the fourth slide identifies the historical twilight zone attached in trying to sort out the problems related to the definition of amateurism. Again, our students' infractions very often fall in this twilight zone.

The task force has decided at its recent meeting to undertake a two-prong approach to the consideration of amateurism. The first prong will be to consider our Division III philosophy and core values and attempt to develop recommendations regarding amateurism rules consistent with what is right for Division III.

The second prong will be to monitor and assess the changes in Divisions I and II and to analyze any possible impact they might have on Division III rules and regulations regarding amateurism. It shows we want to do what is right for Division III and our unique approach to athletics and higher education, but we also want to live in the real world and be mindful of the impact differences in Divisions I, II and III might have in the membership.

Finally, the task force has identified four important Division III core values to keep in mind as we consider the issue of amateurism. The first is clarity, common sense, and consistency of rules; the second, student-athlete welfare; the third, competitive fairness; and the fourth, consistency with the Division III philosophy.

At the end, we're going to challenge you with some issues to think about. But for now, I would like to turn the mike over to JoAnn Andregg, who will talk about specific Division III problems. JoAnn.

JoAnn Andregg (University of St. Thomas, Minnesota): Thank you, Tom. My job is to identify for you the five problems that the Amateurism Task Force sees currently in regard to Division III amateurism rules. The first of those problems is that the current rules do not support the Division III philosophy regarding deregulation and student-athlete welfare. If you read your mission statement for Division III, it does encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for our students. More importantly, it assures that student-athletes are not treated differently from other members of the general student body.

If I am a prodigy in piano, and before I enter college, if I decide to enter piano competition and I get money for that competition, that is not held against me in college. Therefore, my abilities in piano are not held against me. Whereas an athlete does not have the same opportunity. You've heard the committee before us talk about deregulation and the fact that all of our rules are being scrutinized currently with regard to the intent, purpose and consistency.

Problem No. 2, our current rules lack clarity, consistency and

common sense, as you've just heard from Tom. For example, if you take the time to look at the definition of professional in the Division III Manual, you will read that it includes any person who receives payment. The problem with that particular rule is there are 10 exemptions to the amateurism rule. You can find those 10 exemptions on page 57 and page 58 of the Division III Manual.

The Division III Manual points out the line of demarcation to tell a professional from a nonprofessional. This is no longer the case. Amateurism is not a light switch, but rather it seems in this day and age to be a general continuum.

Problem No. 3 is that currently the most severe sanctions are applied to student-athletes who intend to professionalize. It is a real problem for the NCAA staff and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee to evaluate intent to professionalize. The reason I am on the amateurism task force is that my passion grew out of the topic because I was sparked by my experiences dealing with the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee and trying to define the term "intent to professionalize." Currently, an athlete merely has to sign a contract and that is deemed intent to professionalize.

Currently, if a prospective student-athlete talks with an agent, signs with an agent, or tries out with a professional team, even if they get cut on their first day of tryouts, this is termed intent to professionalize. The problems I have had on the committee do not deal with the number of cases I have had in this area, but rather the heart-breaking situation it creates when you deem an individual ineligible for life in that particular sport.

Problem No. 4, the current sanctions are too severe for some amateurism violations. An example would be if a Division III prospect signs a professional contract, tries out and gets cut, that individual does lose all eligibility in that sport for life. Usually, when a prospect enters into that contract, they have no idea of the ramifications of their actions. The other problem I have found in dealing with the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee is that we currently have no way of dealing with or addressing mitigating factors.

Problem No. 5, the current amateurism rules attempt to control the activities of prospects and organizations over whom the NCAA has no direct control. There is an unrealistic assumption that these individuals and organizations should have knowledge of NCAA rules. Most of you in this room have experienced that if you've ever talked about NCAA eligibility rules with a foreign student-athlete.

Lastly, as we all know, I will talk about—as the saying goes—the devil in the details. Our committee is going to be looking at several different areas of analysis. This is not an exhaustive list. I am sure that our committee will take many side trips in bringing forth legislation concerning these next six topics. The first one is permissible forms of pay. An example would be expense money, prize money and educational stipends. These are currently forms of pay that do exist out there now.

Point No. 2 would be the signing of a professional contract, with or without an agent, and entering the draft. As you know, in some sports, you have to put your name in the draft; in other sports, you are drafted without your knowledge.

Fourth, competing with professionals. Currently, your athletes may compete against professionals but they cannot compete with professionals.

Five is the acceptance of pay for a prospect's athletics reputation. And six, an organized competition rule that addresses competitive experience prior to collegiate enrollment but certainly after high-school graduation.

I will now turn over the podium to Jennifer Strawley, who is a student-athlete reinstatement representative from the NCAA.

Jennifer Strawley (NCAA Staff): Thank you, JoAnn. It is important for Division III to look at the amateurism issue from a Division III perspective. However, at the same time, we must be aware of the possible impact of changes within Division I and II. As Tom stated earlier, both the Division I Subcommittee on Amateurism and Agents and the Division II Amateurism Project Team are proposing significant changes to the current amateurism legislation. Their deregulation centers on the adoption of an organized competition rule. I will explain this rule in more detail on the next slide; however, the purpose of this rule is to address the individual's competitive experiences post high-school graduation and prior to collegiate enrollment.

I'm not going to go into too much detail regarding how Division I and II reached their consensus in regard to deregulation; however, I will tell you they took very different paths and ended up with similar proposals. The areas of deregulation that both Divisions I and II are proposing are to allow prospective student-athletes to accept prize money based on their place finish; to allow a prospective student-athlete to place his or her name on a professional draft list; to allow a prospect to sign a contract with a professional team; to allow a prospective student-athlete to participate on a professional team; and to allow a prospective student-athlete to accept pay for other forms of competition for their athletics participation. I will express, as Tom said at this time, that currently all these proposals deal only with individual activities prior to collegiate enrollment.

Now, with this deregulation, both Division I and Division II are looking to adopt an organized competition rule, which will serve as the cornerstone for their deregulation. The specifics of this rule are as follows. After an individual graduates from high school, if they compete in organized competition, they will be charged with a season of competition for each year of organized competition they participate in. In addition, upon enrollment, they must fulfill an academic year in residence. Let me give you an example.

An individual graduates from high school in the spring of 2000 and then competes as an amateur on the tennis circuit or with dereg-

ulation as a professional on the tennis circuit and then enrolls at an NCAA Division I or II institution in the fall of 2002. They must first sit for an academic year in residence and then will have two seasons of competition within their five-year or 10-semester clock inasmuch as they will be charged the two seasons for their participation prior to collegiate enrollment.

Let me shift gears slightly and share with you some actual Division III precedent regarding this task force area of analysis. The first area I am going to discuss is prize money. In this case, the student-athlete receives \$50 based on his place finish in a road race. His eligibility was reinstated after he repaid \$50. In the next case, the student-athlete accepted \$500 based on her place in skiing races. Again, eligibility was reinstated after she repaid the money. As you can see in these examples, the simple repayment of the money brings back an individual's amateur status.

Look at the next example. It involves two individuals who participated in the 1996 Summer Olympics. Both swimmers qualified to receive \$80,000 based on their place-finish from both the USOC and USA Swimming. The first individual accepted the prize money inasmuch as she came from a family of somewhat moderate means, and the expenses are quite significant to swim at this level. Although to date no reinstatement request has been submitted, at a minimum, she would be required to repay this money.

The second individual, who also competed in the 1996 Summer Olympics and qualified to receive \$80,000, declined this prize money and she is currently participating at an NCAA institution. The question the task force is currently looking at is: In the acceptance of this money, what separates these two, when, in fact, they had the same competitive experiences leading up to their collegiate enrollment?

The next area of analysis involves the signing of a professional contract. The student-athlete reinstatement staff views these as the epitomized example of a failed professional. In this case, the prospect signed a baseball contract with a minor league team. The contract did include a \$10,000 signing bonus; however, the prospect was released from the team and never competed and never accepted any money.

As JoAnn and Tom both stated earlier, the current analysis for the student-athlete reinstatement staff and the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee centers on the individual's intent to professionalize. Admittedly, this is a somewhat subjective analysis; however, basing it on behaviors, the act of signing a contract shows one's intent to professionalize. Therefore, as in this case, his eligibility was not reinstated.

In the next example, the individual again signed a contract and agreed to receive a monthly payment of \$650. The student-athlete was released from the team and never received any compensation and never competed. Again, because he showed clear intent to professionalize by signing this contract, they have further lost their eli-

gibility at an NCAA institution.

The final area of analysis that we're going to look at today involves competition with professionals. In this case, the prospect competed in 16 contests with a professional soccer team. The prospect did not sign a contract and received \$300 in actual and necessary expenses. The key point to this precedent is that the individual did not sign a contract. By not signing a contract, they never showed a clear intent to professionalize themselves and did not cross the threshold of not warranting reinstatement. The student-athlete was withheld from 25 percent in order to address the 16 contests they competed in at the professional level.

At this point, I'm going to turn the podium over to Les Poolman, who will lead the audience into a discussion and pose some questions the task force is currently contemplating. Again, as Tom stated, we are interested in your feedback and looking for your ideas regarding amateurism.

Les Poolman (Dickinson College): Thank you, Jen. The committee felt it imperative that you, the membership, have an opportunity to make comments and publicly engage in a productive discussion of the issues. We are particularly interested in your thoughts and perceptions with regard to athletes receiving prize money, signing a professional contract or participating in a professional draft. To precipitate and stimulate some discussion, even at this late time of the day, we will provide you on the screen with four questions that we began to wrestle with as a committee at our initial meeting last month.

Specifically, we wrestled with the distinction between acts that ordinarily do not necessarily affect competitive equity, such as accepting prize money, being drafted, and signing a contract, compared to those acts that do provide a competitive advantage, for example, competing on a professional team. So we go through the four questions and then we'll go back one by one. I really hope that you will participate in this discussion.

The first question, as you can see: Why does the acceptance of prize money make a prospective student-athlete inappropriate for Division III programs? Second question: Why does the repayment of the prize money return an individual to amateur status? Third: Why does the act of signing a professional contract or placing your name in the draft make a prospective student-athlete inappropriate for Division III programs? (Laughter) I was imported to continue this.

The fourth question: Does the adoption of an organized competition rule address competitive equity? I'd like to reiterate also that we are only in the early stages of potential deregulation, and indeed, none of us are committed to any particular direction. So I urge you to step up to the microphone and let us hear your thoughts. Let's go back to the first question.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): You've already given us the phrase "generally available to student body," "use of athletic

ability," Article 15, Bylaw 15. Consistency. It seems to me we have a consistent philosophy, cited 20.11-(f). What do you do with the second one? What did you do about it? Do you pay it back?

Mr. Poolman: Thank you very much. Let's go to the second question. Any comments? Okay, let's try the third question in case anybody has any comments.

Mr. Dodson: It's just a repeat of the first question and it's the same answer. They're using their athletic ability. Just like we do in Article 15, just like we do across the board. They're professionals.

Julie Roe-Sumner (NCAA Staff): Currently, with student-athlete reinstatement precedent, we do see many Division III cases where—Jennifer showed you two examples—we have prospects or student-athletes who accept small sums of money, either \$50 to \$100, in cross country and track and then in the sport of tennis, they may receive a couple of hundred dollars but usually their expenses are plausible, whatever the prize money is they receive.

When they come through the reinstatement process, the precedent is very clear in requiring repayment in order for them to be reinstated to amateur status. So currently, those folks who aren't accepting prize money, because the actual competition against professionals is permissible under Bylaw 12, the only violation they commit is accepting that prize money.

Mr. Dodson: We just had a panel before your panel. Here's the incident as I see it. If the first task is to get leveled out to where things are, we need to illustrate that in the Manual. As, for example, we're talking about pay. Pay is in Article 12. If we look specifically at itemized incidental expenses, we've got 12.1.1, 1.4.4, all those numbers. Compare it to 16—16.9.1, 16.8.1.6. Just looking at the numbers, right away you feel, wait a minute. Yet all three are the identical topic and that is unitemized incidental expenses. So first get the numbers straight.

Two, we are talking, are we not, about mitigating factors. That's what your committee does. You look at those mitigating factors and you make a decision. The answer there is do we really settle on what the mitigating factors are, if there are any important mitigating factors generally available to the student body. One thing we don't talk enough about is incidental to participation in intercollegiate athletics. Let's get that out. Let's talk about what is required to do that and then the solution is to have your database, to have it when you deal with it.

You named one, in the case, if it had been an Article 16 expense, you would have gone to the Management Council two-thirds majority vote, 16.13. So it seems to me it's an obvious route to go. I think the two committees ought to sit down together awhile and talk about where they're going and get that overlaying thread and make the work in this area too.

Unidentified Delegate: It would seem to me that the question is, does the NCAA have a right to tell people before they enroll in

school what their behavioral patterns would be? Secondly, are we prepared to give them all the information they need to make a decision as to when you're a 14-year-old, do you take this? Is it indeed making you ineligible?

Third, getting back to the Olympic ideal, only the wealthy can be amateurs. Because if you use the Olympic swimmer as an example, the one who could afford it stayed amateur and the one who couldn't had to turn pro. With the draft situation here, some athletes are in the draft whether they like it or not and they have an idea where they stand; i.e., baseball and ice hockey. Others who put their name in the draft, basketball and football, risk their amateur status.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): We're dealing with a social redefinition of what an amateur and what a professional is. As much as we may or may not like it, I grew up idolizing Olympic athletes. Now, with the intrusion of professional athletes into the Olympic movement, I'm not sure who's a professional and who's an amateur. I know that at the Division III level, we don't expect our student-athletes to be professional athletes. Isn't it all based on sports-specific professionalism? If you are a road racer and you earn prize money as a road racer but you want to participate as a baseball player, there's no effect, correct? So is that student a professional, or are they an amateur?

This committee's got a lot of work ahead of it because we're looking at redefining amateurism based on what our society is doing, because we're not getting these kids from another planet. They're coming out of our society. We've got to decide whether or not the redefinition of what an amateur and professional is going to be acceptable to us. I wish you a lot of luck.

Mr. Poolman: I think you're right. I think we do have a lot of work. I think we've barely scratched the surface in our initial meeting and one conference call. But we really do need your input. As you leave here and think about some of these topics, if you will send us an e-mail, communicate with us somehow as we move on.

Gloria Scott (Bennett College): Both committees have brought some very pointed and very stiff issues. Carlyle's comment in saying that he wished you well struck me to say he wishes all of us well. Your comment about input. I think each of the cases, perhaps there's a way that the NCAA can create some interactive Web sites so that institutions can go to those and put comments and questions in right away without having to go to pencil and paper back and forth, and realize there's a way of collecting data and interact with it. Then all of us could be in on the position and we can have discussions. We all know about amateurism, etc. So if those two committee areas are opened up to do some interactive Web sites, I think that would be very good and give us some instant information.

Mr. Poolman: That's an excellent point. Thank you very much. Hopefully, the NCAA staff can answer.

Jennifer Strawley (NCAA Staff): I will comment on that. We

are looking to follow this up with an article in The NCAA News to keep you up-to-date on what's going on. In addition, we'll try to get an amateurism click on the Web site where you can go specifically to interact. So we are working on that.

Mr. Poolman: At this time, I would like to turn it back over to Tom Weingartner, who will give us some concluding remarks. Thank you very much for staying. (Applause)

Tom Weingartner (University of Chicago): Thank you very much for your attention. We are going to develop a communication plan—I hate that kind of language, but for lack of a better term—to attempt to get back out to the membership to continue to consider these issues. They are very difficult issues and issues that are being grappled with at the Division I and II level as well as our level. So we will do our best to give you the byproduct of our best thinking and attempt to get feedback from you through various mediums and then continue to talk about this at the next Convention.

Thank you very much for your patience. I will turn the podium back over to President Die.

Ms. Die: Thank you very much. I'll ask the members of the panel to remain while we complete our session today. My sincere thanks to them for serving on the task force for a very interesting, challenging and complex area. I urge all of you to think about the important questions and issues you've just heard, especially in light of our Division III philosophy. Please watch the evolution of this issue over the next two years and forward your feedback to the task force and the governance structure.

I have been informed of no other topics of interest that the delegates wish to discuss. I see no one at the microphones. Let me remind you that we will reconvene our Division III business session tomorrow at 8 a.m. in this room. Tomorrow, we will address the remaining proposals. Those all will be paddle votes and we will consider many of them as a package. We will also elect our new Management Council members.

The remainder of the morning will focus on two discussion topics. First will be a discussion regarding athletics performance enhancements. Student-athlete welfare remains a priority for the division. This discussion should draw attention to a relevant health and safety issue and provide data regarding athletic performance enhancements and implications for the Division III athletic community. Dr. Gary Green of UCLA will lead that session. It should prove to be very interesting.

Second, we will hear a presentation regarding a recently completed study on NCAA public relations. This discussion will include the Association's new public affairs plan. The plan will directly affect Division III. So I encourage your attendance tomorrow morning. I do thank you for your attention and participation today. As you depart, please leave your voting machines behind. There have been several suggestions as to what we should do with them. (Laughter) We

stand adjourned.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.]

Tuesday Morning, January 11, 2000

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Die: The Division III business session will come to order. We need to move through our legislation because I know there will be individuals who have planes to catch and we want to get as much done as possible and have an opportunity for presentations and discussion.

Good morning and welcome to this morning's business session for Division III. I would like briefly to review this morning's schedule as reflected on page 13 of the Convention Program. We are scheduled to meet until 11 a.m. this morning and we will focus on four primary topics.

First, we will consider Proposal Nos. 59 through 94 from the Convention Notice. That is a significant legislative agenda before us. However, we will conduct paddle votes for all of those proposals. We will consider many of them in groups. We hope to begin that portion of the agenda in about one hour. As he did so ably yesterday, John Biddiscombe again will preside over that portion of our agenda.

After we conclude our legislative agenda, we will elect our new Management Council members. The process should take just a few minutes. Then we will begin our morning discussions. The first session will feature Dr. Gary Green of UCLA and will focus on the issue of athletics performance enhancements. We've scheduled about an hour for that session. This issue directly affects the welfare of our student-athletes, as well as the competitive equity within our division, so I urge you to attend this session.

In our second discussion session, we will hear the results of the recent NCAA public relations study and review the Association's new public affairs plan. We will keep things relevant by focusing directly on findings and initiatives related to Division III. This is important new information that has not yet been released, and I know you will find it interesting. That session should last about 45 minutes.

After the public affairs session concludes, we will open the window for legislative reconsideration in case anyone has a change of heart related to this morning's proposals. Finally, we will open the floor for any questions if time permits. We are scheduled to meet until 11 a.m.

There are a couple of announcements I would like to make at this time. There are many voting units that still need to be turned in. We haven't found a donor for them. (Laughter) We will not use them today, but you may leave them at your place. There's someone in the back who will take them up. If you would like to take them to the man who is taking up voting machines, please go ahead and take them. Leave your paddles at your place when you have to leave and they will be picked up after the meeting is over. Any questions? If

there are no questions, I will now ask John Biddiscombe to preside over this morning's legislative agenda.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

John Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thank you, President Die, and good morning everyone. As you've just heard, we have a significant amount of legislation to consider this morning. We will consider Proposals 59 through 94 as listed in the Convention Program. We will consider the proposals in the order they are listed on pages 107 through 108 of the Convention Notice. Also, please remember that pages 5 and 6 of the Convention Program contain minor editorial corrections and clarifications that affect some of the proposals we will consider this morning. Are there any questions?

To begin, we will consider Proposals No. 59 through 79, the deregulation package. As you heard during yesterday's discussion session, we will consider these proposals as a group. However, if you wish to have any proposal this morning considered separately, please make that request as soon as 59 through 79 are moved and seconded. If that does not occur, we will vote on the remainder of the package first and then consider the proposals removed from the package individually and in numerical order.

We will now consider Proposals No. 59 through 79.

Deregulation Package

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): As chair of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee and on behalf of the Division III ILC, the Management Council and the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of the entire deregulation package, Proposals 59 through 79, noting the withdrawal of Proposals 76 and 77, both of which require further review by the committee.

[The motion was seconded.]

Over the past two years, the committee has conducted a line-by-line review of Bylaws 10 to 17. The package before you consists of the substantive revisions produced as a result of those efforts. Many of these proposals are intended to remove legislation that is inconsistent with the Division III philosophy or is not applicable to Division III. The remainder of these proposals represent an attempt to clarify or simplify the Division III Manual. Each of these proposals has been reviewed and supported by the Division III Presidents and Management Councils.

I urge your support of the entire deregulation package. Thank you.

[The deregulation package (Page A-69) was adopted.]

Permissible Expenses—Meals

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of the Management Council and the Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 80.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit an institution to provide meal expenses to a student-athlete who serves on a university committee when he or she misses a regular meal as a result of a committee meeting conducted when regular institutional dining facilities are open, provided such expenses are available to students in general. The adoption of this proposal will represent another important step in our efforts to address student-athlete welfare issues. I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 80.

[Proposal No. 80 (Page A-94) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Housing and Meals—Vacation-Period Expenses

Lon Boike (Clarke College): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 81.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit an institution to provide room-and-board expenses for a specific period of time to student-athletes who return to the institution's campus during a vacation period following institutional competition. It is a common occurrence for an institution's team to return to campus upon season-ending competition such as the last regular-season contest, conference tournament or full-season tournament during an institutional vacation period. Under the current legislation, it is not permissible for the institution to provide any expenses to student-athletes once they arrive back on campus, even if the dormitories and dining facilities are closed.

Although the current legislation does allow institutions to provide travel expenses to student-athletes for a period of time, up to 36 hours following the end of competition, this does not include room and board expenses once the student-athletes have returned to the institution's campus. This proposal will provide institutions the discretion of providing room and board for a reasonable period of time in these situations.

The adoption of this proposal will represent another important step in our interest to address student-athlete welfare issues. It also makes sense in the spirit of deregulation. On behalf of the Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, I urge you to vote "yes" on this proposal.

[Proposal No. 81 (Page A-95) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Practice Expenses—Women's Rowing—Weather Exception

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 82.

[The motion was seconded.]

The proposal will permit intercollegiate teams in the sport of

rowing to travel up to 200 miles outside the institution's state to engage in practice activities that occur during an institution's academic term when necessitated by weather conditions. The sport of rowing is similar to skiing inasmuch as both sports have facility requirements dependent upon access to natural, as opposed to man-made, venues. Institutions geographically located further north often are prevented from practicing in the spring because lakes and rivers are frozen.

To increase the distance outside the institution's states for which expenses can be provided for practice activities will provide greater flexibility to accommodate necessary practice needs. It should be noted that the current legislation that prohibits student-athletes from missing class time from practice activities will remain applicable.

I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal No. 82.

[Proposal No. 82 (Page A-96) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Permissible Benefits—Reasonable Refreshments

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 83.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit an institution to provide student-athletes with reasonable refreshments for student-athlete educational and business meetings and on an occasional basis for celebratory events, provided such event is available to students in general. Historically, incidental expense requests have been granted without exception for these types of events. The adoption of this proposal will permit institutions to provide this benefit without having to seek an incidental expense waiver from the national office. I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 83.

[Proposal No. 83 (Page A-97) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Annual Exemptions—Alumni Contests—Division III Basketball

Steve Argo (Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 84.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit Division III institutions to annually exempt alumni contests in the sport of basketball. Current legislation does not permit institutions to exempt alumni contests in the sport of basketball. In an effort to provide basketball student-athletes opportunities similar to those in other sports, one basketball alumni contest should be permitted to be exempt from the annual maximum number of basketball contests at the institution's discretion.

In the spirit of rules simplification, I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal 84.

Dick Kaiser (Defiance College): I have a question, and I don't know when it's appropriate to ask. It's already passed, but I don't know when it's appropriate for me to ask it.

Mr. Biddiscombe: The chair would like to request that you save your question until we finish voting on this proposal, then come to the microphone and I'll recognize you.

[Proposal No. 84 (Page A-98) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Mr. Kaiser: I have a question for anyone who sponsored No. 81. I just need a clarification. I apologize for getting up here, but we were talking about it and it got voted on and passed before we could finish talking about it. On the vacation period situation, I've read and I understand that it's 48 hours after you return to campus in between terms, but what about an institution that has a term not end until mid-January? If that term doesn't begin until mid-January, then they come back after Christmas to do their finals and everything, would it be legal to pay for the room and board of the institution's student-athlete from the time your Christmas vacation began until that semester returned in mid-January, which could be over a month?

Mr. Biddiscombe: We have members of our staff discussing this and we'll have an answer in a moment for you.

Chris Martin (NCAA Staff): Can you repeat the question for me?

Mr. Kaiser: Certainly. My question is if an institution's term does not end, as many institutions do, prior to Christmas but in fact ends in mid-January after Christmas break, the way I read this, is that because that's not the end of the term, you are therefore capable now, with the passage of this, to house and feed a student-athlete from the time your vacation and for Christmas begins until you return for that start of that term, for the conclusion of that term? Because it is a vacation time, not in between terms.

Mr. Martin: Let's see if I understand you correctly. So the classes would still continue after the term and would not be over prior to the Christmas break?

Mr. Kaiser: That's the question, yes.

Mr. Martin: Our interpretation of that is that would not change. This proposal is specific to vacation period expenses and in your case would still be during the regular academic term.

Mr. Kaiser: So therefore the 48-hour rule?

Lynn Holzman (NCAA Staff): In your instance, we just want to make sure we're clear in understanding this. The academic term, in your case, the Christmas or the holiday break has occurred in the middle of that term essentially. The term is not completed, correct?

Mr. Kaiser: That's the question.

Ms. Holzman: The 48-hour legislation, this proposal does not negate that whatsoever. The proposal specifically and only addresses the time period that is an institution's official vacation period, as listed in the catalog. This proposal addresses those situations in which a sports season has concluded during an official vacation period. The student-athlete is returning back to campus. You're able to

provide the expenses for them to remain on your campus, not essentially having to leave. When the academic term resumes, this legislation is no longer applicable because it only addresses the vacation time period. So you're then back in your normal application, whether it's financial aid legislation, whatever, because they're then back to the academic term.

Mr. Kaiser: You lost me. You're saying that our vacation period isn't a vacation period?

Ms. Holzman: No, no. Let me try to give you an example here. If you have a fall-sport athlete, let's just say for example . . .

Mr. Kaiser: Let's use basketball because that's probably appropriate.

Ms. Holzman: Okay. This proposal does not address it because the proposal only addresses the time period of those sports in which their season has concluded. As it says, it's when you return to campus at the end of the regular season, whether it's from postseason or conference tournament competition. Basketball, in this case, crosses over two seasons, so during vacation periods, there is already legislation that exists that if a student-athlete is required to be on campus for practice or competition, you can provide those expenses.

This proposal addresses those situations in which their season has concluded during a vacation period. Your student-athletes are coming back to campus and a lot of times, let's just say that there was a four-day changeover from the middle of your vacation period and when it ends. You can only provide expenses for a total of 48 hours afterwards, and there is oftentimes a discrepancy between the vacation period and the next term beginning.

Mr. Biddiscombe: I think it's important that we move on. The chair would like to remind the delegates if there's still not full clarity on this question, that the NCAA has an interpretations booth out in the lobby that's staffed the entire time the Convention is open. We welcome you and encourage you to seek out further clarification on this proposal.

We are now ready to consider Proposal No. 85.

Annual Exemptions—Alumni Meet— Indoor and Outdoor Track and Field

Lon Boike (Clarke College): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 85.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit Division III institutions to annually exempt one date of competition in indoor track and outdoor track and field each year with an alumni team of the institution. The current legislation does not permit institutions to exempt alumni contests in the sport of track and field. In an effort to provide track and field student-athletes opportunities similar to those in other sports, one track

and field alumni date of competition should be exempt from the annual maximum number of track and field dates of competition at the institution's discretion. I urge you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 85.

[Proposal No. 85 (Page A-98) was adopted, effective immediately.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Contest Exemptions

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 86.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will permit an institution to exempt on an annual basis the National Wrestling Coaches Association meet from the maximum contest limitations in the sport of wrestling. The National Wrestling Coaches Association meet is an annual one-day event held during the wrestling season. It is an invitational meet that features the top two ranked wrestlers in each weight classification. Because of the limited number of student-athletes participating from each institution, participants in the meet often counts as an individual and institutional date of competition. Thus, it may be necessary for some institutions to deny student-athletes the opportunity to participate in the event to avoid counting participation in the institution's maximum contest limitations.

This proposal will provide individual student-athletes the opportunity to participate in such an event without affecting institutional limits. It should also be noted that similar exemptions, such as the East/West Golf Match, are applicable in other sports. The committee urges you to vote "yes" for Proposal No. 86.

[Proposal No. 86 (Page A-99) was adopted.]

International Competition—Summers

Pat Damore (State University of New York Athletic Conference): On behalf of the SUNYAC, I move Proposal 87.

[The motion was seconded.]

The purpose of this proposed legislation is simply to allow the student who has not participated in a regular season to compete on a foreign tour without using a season of eligibility. This is consistent with legislation in Divisions I and II and is more pro student than the current legislation. Foreign tours can occur only once in four years, and at our level usually last one or two weeks. Where a student does not participate in a regular season, declaring this as a season of eligibility is unnecessarily disparate. Our goal is to encourage participation.

We encourage you to vote "yes" for Proposal 87.

Joy Reighn (Rowan University): On behalf of the Division III Management Council and Presidents Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 87 and the amendment-to-amendment.

[The motion was seconded.]

This amendment-to-amendment is consistent with the original

intent of the sponsors of Proposal No. 87, based on communication between the Management Council, the presidents and the governance staff. This amendment would permit the student-athlete to participate on a foreign tour, provided the student-athlete was a full-time student during the previous academic year and has established eligibility from subsequent years prior to the beginning of the fourth. This amendment-to-amendment appears in current Divisions I and II legislation.

I urge you to support this amendment-to-amendment.

Carlyle Carter (Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I need a point of clarification. How would this affect incoming student-athletes?

Chris Martin (NCAA Staff): To answer that question, Carlyle, I refer you to Bylaw 30.7.2.1. The first sentence in that bylaw says "... it is not permissible for an incoming student-athlete to participate as a member of the institution's team on a foreign tour that occurs prior to the beginning of his or her first term."

Mr. Carter: Would that be referenced in the new legislation?

Mr. Martin: Yes.

Tom Bohlson (Heartland Collegiate Athletic Conference): Our question is in regard to transfers. How are transfers affected by this? Does that previous enrollment have to be in the school where he is making the trip, or could a student have been enrolled at another institution?

Mr. Biddiscombe: The staff is uncertain exactly how to respond. We're going to refer that back to the Interpretations Committee and then develop a response to your question.

[Proposal No. 87 (Page A-100) was adopted as amended.]

Membership Requirements—Minimum Participants— Division III Women's Fencing

Susan Chapman (Worcester State College): As a member of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, and on behalf of Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 88.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will specify that in the sport of women's fencing, an institution's team shall include a minimum of five participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the NCAA's minimum contest requirements. The proposed increase in the minimum participant requirement for women's fencing is necessary in order to reflect the addition of women's epee in 1995. Because an institution is unable to win an intercollegiate fencing contest with less than five student-athletes, the proposed recommendation to increase the minimum from three to five is necessary and appropriate.

I urge you to vote "yes" on Proposal 88.

[Proposal No. 88 (Page A-100) was adopted, effective immediately.]

NCAA Championships—Bench Personnel—Logo Restrictions

Susan Chapman (Worcester State College): As a member of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee, and on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal 89.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal specifies that logo restrictions on student-athlete apparel will apply during NCAA championships to all personnel who are in the team bench area for practices and games and who participate in NCAA news conferences. This will include coaches, trainers, and managers.

One of the Association's basic principles of amateurism is to protect student-athletes from exploitation by commercial enterprises. To further that principle, the Association has placed appropriate restrictions on the size of logos that may appear on apparel worn by student-athletes participating in competition. However, there currently are no logo restrictions on apparel worn by coaches or other bench personnel, and concern has been expressed that the potential for commercial exploitation, particularly at the site of NCAA championships, could result.

This proposal will ensure that student-athletes, coaches and other bench personnel are promoting their institution, as opposed to any commercial entity. I urge your support of Proposal 89.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I would like to speak in opposition to this. As someone who's been in championships and hosted championships, this rule is infrequently enforced on a consistent basis. Sometimes you're written up, sometimes you're not. The NCAA has their own promotional literature for things like women's soccer. It's hard enough to keep track of your athletes. There's tape on pictures, award ceremonies on hats and golf bags and tennis bags. This is a Division I issue. This doesn't affect us at all. I urge you to not support it so you don't have to buy new rain gear, new everything for your trainers and coaches. I don't think this applies to us at all. (Applause)

Walter Johnson (North Central College): If a piece of apparel has both the logo at the institution and a commercial logo, which one takes precedent? Would the individual have to remove that piece of apparel or not wear it even though it's promoting their institution, because it also has a sport logo and a commercial logo of some sort?

Lynn Holzman (NCAA Staff): To answer your question about the manufacturer's or trademark logo of a commercial entity versus an institutional logo, the current legislation bylaw cite that deals with it is 12.5.5, "Use of Logos on Equipment, Uniforms and Apparel." This proposed legislation specifically deals with commercial logos and manufacturer logos. If there is an institutional logo, this proposal and that legislation does not address it nor is it concerned with that. It is simply the commercial aspect on that. So the restriction that this proposal relates to is that commercial logo aspect.

Mr. Johnson: So you're saying that if there is an institutional logo and a commercial logo, then if that commercial logo does not comply with the legislation that's being proposed now, it would supersede the institution's logo and the piece of apparel would have to be removed?

Ms. Holzman: To answer your question, the institutional logo is actually a moot point. That has no bearing whatsoever on this proposal or the current legislation that exists in Bylaw 12. If the commercial logo that you have on a piece of apparel or equipment, whether it's for a student-athlete currently or bench personnel that this proposal addresses, it is inappropriate whether it's exceeding the size restrictions or whatever. Yes, that piece of apparel or equipment would be in violation of the legislation. The institutional logo is moot. The only size restrictions for issues related to institutional logos would have to be addressed by the individual sport committees.

[Proposal No. 89 (Page A-101) was defeated.]

Consent Package

Myrtes Dunn Green (Stillman College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of the entire consent package, Proposals 90 through 94.

[The motion was seconded.]

The Management and Presidents Councils have deemed these five proposals noncontroversial in nature and in the best interest of the entire Division III membership. For ease of voting, the proposals have been placed in this consent package. On behalf of the Division III Management and Presidents Councils, I urge you to adopt the five proposals contained in this package. Thanks.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): I'd like to separate out No. 91, please.

Mr. Biddiscombe: Thank you. We will obviously separate out Proposal No. 91 from the remainder of the package. The first thing we need to do is vote on the immediate effective date for the remaining proposals in that package, vote on the proposal, and then come back to No. 91. I do not see any other speakers, so therefore please take your paddles. We'll vote on the immediate effective date for the consent package.

[The immediate effective date for the consent package (Page A-102) was approved.]

De Minimis Violation—Requirement for Practice

JoAnn Andregg (University of St. Thomas, Minnesota): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 91.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal, similar to other de minimis legislation, will reduce the delay and simplify the process for violations in which no recruiting or competitive advantage was gained by a member institution. The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee believes that no re-

cruiting or competitive advantage has been gained in those instances in which a student-athlete practices without the institution's knowledge while enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies.

The institution would be required to report such violations as institutional violations, but the student-athletes's eligibility would not be affected. The student-athlete would be immediately eligible for practice or competition upon reenrollment in a full-time program of studies. The adoption of this proposal will still hold the institution accountable for such a violation; however, the student-athletes's eligibility would not be affected. I urge your support of Proposal No. 91. Thank you.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference): I want to consider a couple of aspects of this. The first is just straight practice. Because if a student were to practice while enrolled in less than 12 hours, then there would be no charge of a current offense nor would there be a season of competition since they hadn't competed. However, we passed No. 52, with a ruling. The ruling was specifically that if they were an ineligible student-athlete who competed in the preseason, they would not be charged a season of competition even though they competed while ineligible. Put the two together and you first have a very interesting redshirt concept that's very different from what we have.

Secondly, since the rationale mentions recruiting, if you were going to redshirt someone, the reason usually is because they're very good, showing a lot of promise but maybe don't have the ability yet, don't have quite enough experience. Therefore, you're going to red-shirt.

Now, in recruiting, quite often an athlete of that caliber has buddies who are much better than they are and who are not headed to Division III. However, if, in the preseason, since there are in existence two exceptions—and I promised Don Schael I wouldn't use numbers—the first is preliminary to enrollment and the second is the first five days of classes, both of which have three requirements.

The first is they have to be accepted for enrollment as a full-time student, so let's speak there. The buddy—I want the big buddy who's going to go to Notre Dame—all his buddy has to say, who's planning to redshirt is, "come on with me." It doesn't cost you a penny. You don't have to preenroll. Your expenses will be paid, live in the dorm, get the meals, see what's going on down there. If you don't like it, go home. Because they've changed the rules because you don't have to be eligible to practice.

I think it's a bad rule. I hope you vote it down. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 91 (Page A-103) was adopted, effective immediately.]

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Biddiscombe: That concludes our initial consideration of proposed legislation this morning. I will now turn the microphone

over to President Die, who will preside until we open the window of reconsideration after our last discussion during this session. Thank you for your attention and cooperation.

ELECTION OF MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEMBERS

Ms. Die: Thank you, John. Our next item of business involves the election of our new Management Council members. You'll recall that under our new governance structure, the Nominating Committee initially selects Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council review those nominations, but the positions ultimately are filled by a vote of our membership during our annual business session. I believe we have three appointments to make. To present the official slate of nominees, I'm happy to introduce Art Eason, director of athletics at William Paterson University of New Jersey and chair of the Nominating Committee. Art.

Art Eason (William Paterson University of New Jersey): As chair of the Division III Nominating Committee, and on behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move for formal election of three representatives into the Division III Management Council. This slate of candidates was approved by the Management Council and the Presidents Council at their October 1999 meeting. It is now presented before the Division III membership for election.

[Note: The slate of candidates for the Management Council was approved.]

Walter Johnson (North Central College): Before too many of our members leave, I really wanted to make a statement. Dr. Vernon Chalice, grandfather of the civil rights movement, one of the statements that he made was: "If you see a good fight, get in it." Basically, what he meant was if there's a cause that's worth it, get in and work toward all the things that are involved in that cause. The scripture also states: "To whom much is given, much is expected." In essence, people with gifts and talents should use them. People with great voices should sing, great wealth should give, leadership ability should lead.

Four years ago at the NCAA national Convention, John Biddiscombe was elected to the Management Council and is now completing two years as Management Council chair. During that four-year period, the Association has experienced many significant changes. Some of these include, but are not limited to, federation, strategic planning, deregulation and championship restructuring with automatic qualification.

John, you have had an impact on all of us. Your countless hours, unselfish vision, and drive helped us move seamlessly into the new century. All that you have been involved in has helped us maintain that which is central to the mission of the Association—the welfare of the student-athlete. On behalf of the entire membership, I thank you for using your talents and getting in the fight. I stand and hope oth-

ers would join me in thanking you for all that you've done. Thank you, John. (Applause and standing ovation)

Ms. Die: Thank you, Walter. Those who have worked closely with John know that those words are richly deserved.

I want to report on our new appointments to the Presidents Council. As you may remember, the members of that body are appointed by a vote of Division III CEOs. The new members are Robert H. Chambers, president of Western Maryland College; and Peter W. Stanley, president of Pomona College. We welcome them to the Presidents Council.

I would now like to call John Biddiscombe back to the podium to introduce our next speaker.

Mr. Biddiscombe: As we know, Division III athletes spend considerable time in the weight room attempting to get stronger, bigger and faster. They also are looking for a competitive edge to complement this training and enhance their performance. This morning we have someone who can speak to us from a very informed position about the problems associated with this kind of student-athlete behavior.

Dr. Gary Green is the current chair of the NCAA's committee on drug testing and drug education. He is an associate professor at the UCLA Department of Family Medicine and previously served as team physician for UCLA and the University of Delaware and is currently a team physician for Pepperdine University and United States Soccer. Dr. Green is board certified in internal medicine and sports medicine, and in addition to his clinical practice, also is active as a researcher in the field of athletic drug testing and drug addiction and has published many scientific papers in this area. Dr. Green is going to provide us with an update on NCAA drug testing and new drugs student-athletes are taking. Dr. Green. (Applause)

ATHLETICS PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT DISCUSSION

Gary Green: Thank you for having me here. Before I get started, I just want to thank John Biddiscombe for including me in this program. John was actually a member of our committee for about six months. We couldn't understand at the time why he left, but now I can understand that he went on to this. The words that we heard from the previous gentleman, I can understand why you took this. I also want to thank Trinity College Director of Athletics Rick Hazelton from our committee for helping me set this up as well as the NCAA staff liaisons and Mary Wilfert for helping to arrange this talk.

Before we get started, I have one sports medicine joke. It's been very serious this football season, so I'll tell one sports medicine joke that I have. It was the annual football game between the Big Animals and the Little Animals of the forest. In the first half, it was 500 to nothing, Big Animals. The second half starts, the Little Animals kick off. It goes into the end zone, so the Big Animals start running. The

first play happens with the bear around the end. Boom, he's tackled for no gain. So they decide on the second play to run the rhino off tackle. He stops moving. Now they're getting a little nervous and they decide to run the elephant up the middle. The elephant is stopped for no gain, so it's fourth down and they have to punt.

The Little Animals captain, this bird, calls time out and calls the guy over and says, look, the first time we get the ball in the first half, they score every single time they touch the ball. Now we've stopped them three straight times. Who stopped the bear on first down? The centipede raised his hand. He said, you did? Okay, forget about that. Who stopped the rhino on second down? The centipede raised his hand. You again? Okay, well who stopped the elephant on third down? The centipede raised his hand. You again? If you're so damn good, where were you in first half? I was getting my ankles taped. (Laughter and applause) So with that, that's the only sports medicine joke I know.

I have a lot of stuff to cover today. A lot of different topics that hopefully will give you a brief introduction and stimulate some thought. Hopefully we'll have time at the end, because I'm interested in your questions as well. One of the people I also wanted to thank is Mark McGwire, who without him you probably all wouldn't be hearing from me. He really fueled a lot of this debate about supplements. I'm going to spend the last part of my talk talking to you about supplements.

The reason that Rick came to us and suggested this talk is because every time you hear an appeal call for someone who's tested positive, we almost can write the script. It starts exactly the same. Well, I went to the nutrition store and the guy told me it was okay. It turns out that a lot of our athletes who test positive, they don't talk to their coaches, they don't talk to their team doctor, but they're relying on the Internet and the guy at the nutrition store. As athletic directors and part of athletic programs, you have to realize that the eligibility of your athletes may depend on the guy at the nutrition store. In order to help combat that, I want to give you a little information.

First is some background. We think about sports and athletes and ergogenic substances and doping as being a relative recent phenomenon that we saw with Ben Johnson in the Seoul Olympics. But actually, it seems like the drive to take something to jump higher or run faster is a long-standing human emotion. It's documented as far back as the Third Century B.C. that magic mushrooms were used by the Greek athletes during the first Olympiad. Ancient Incas gave cocoa leaves not only to their runners as a reward, but also as a stimulant to help them run farther through the jungles as messengers.

In the Middle Ages, a whole host of substances was considered to be the elixir of life, including alcohol. In the 19th Century, they tried using caffeine, even nitroglycerin and ether and opium by European athletes. Finally, in the 1880s, we have the first documented case of

an athlete dying during athletic competition from an overdose of amphetamines.

Continuing into the 1950s, Soviet athletes construct anabolic steroids and it became introduced to world-class athletics. We all remember the scandal with Ben Johnson, but in the 1960 Rome Olympics, a Danish cyclist died at the end of his cycling race from an overdose of amphetamines. That really stimulated the Olympic movement to begin drug testing.

In 1967, another Tour de France cyclist died in an overdose of amphetamines. We remember in 1972, U.S. swimmer Rick DeMott lost his Olympic gold medal because of the use of dipeptide. There was a little bit more modern drug use in the 1984 Olympics. Several of our U.S. Olympic gold medal cyclists admitted to blood doping. In 1986, the cocaine-related deaths of Len Bias and Don Rogers really spurred the NCAA to begin instituting Association-wide drug testing.

That brings us really to the 1998 Mark McGwire condition using Androstenedione. There was a survey that was done in Sports Illustrated, that said 98 percent, almost 200 current or aspiring Olympians would take a banned substance if they were guaranteed to win but not get caught. Fifty percent of those same people would take the substance if it would contribute to winning every event but result in death after five years. So we know that the drive to take something to run faster, jump higher is very, very strong.

You're going to hear a lot of different things in the newspapers about different drugs. You hear of these terms. An athlete will be caught with a supplement and says it was a legal drug. All of these terms are not very helpful. Prescription drugs are a thing that a doctor can prescribe. As parts of things a doctor can prescribe, there's also controlled substances, which are a little bit more regulated by the government. There's nonprescription or over-the-counter drugs. There's nutritional supplements and natural drugs.

I'm going to talk about all of these. These are not very helpful, but what we try to talk about in terms of drugs is different categories. This is not rating the drug by actually how it's regulated, but by the effect that it's going to have. So the first one we look at is ergogenic or performance enhancing. I think most of you are familiar with forms of performance-enhancing drugs, of which anabolic steroids would be the number one or classic example of a routine drug. These are all drugs that athletes use in order to get a leg up on their competition. That's how I always remember the ergogenic supplements.

The next set that you're all familiar with is recreational drugs. Nonathletes as well as athletes use alcohol, nicotine, cocaine, marijuana, LSD and PCP. Those are some examples. Athletes are not immune to the same forces that nonathletes are when they use recreational drugs.

Finally, our last is therapeutic drugs. These are drugs that are prescribed for people to take in order to correct an underlying medi-

cal problem. For instance, an asthmatic may take an inhaler in order to compete on a normal basis with other people.

Now, I'm going to give you a little information. The NCAA conducts a survey of only NCAA athletes every four years. The last one we did was in 1997. In this case, we sent out to the faculty athletic reps at all NCAA institutions a survey to give to one or two of their teams at their institution. You can see by this, Division III had the lowest response rate. I'm hoping when we redo this in 2001, that we get a better response rate from Division III. Because the more responses we can get from these institutions, the better.

I want you to look at these next few slides because you are going to be quizzed on these. You can see that overall we have about 65 percent, which is not a bad result from the survey. Just to give you demographics, these are the percentage of athletes in each division. Even though we didn't get as many responses as we wanted from Division II and III, if you'll look at the percentage of athletes who competed at the NCAA level, it actually reflects about these percentages. So we were pretty close in what we got here. We had almost 14,000 responses; it was a really good number.

In terms of the demographics and racial makeup, you can see that the majority were white; African-American was the second-most category, followed by a few others. In terms of gender, it was about two to one male to female. We're not going to play "Who Wants to be a Millionaire" but we're going to do a true/false quiz. We're going to give you seven questions on the survey. Let's see how you guys do.

No. 1: Drug use is highest in Division I. How many say false? How many say true? Our survey says that for all of these categories—amphetamines, anabolic steroids, ephedrine, alcohol, cocaine, marijuana, smoking tobacco—Division III was actually the highest or tied for the highest for all of these categories. I'll leave it to you. You probably have a better idea as to why this is, but I will point out that Division III has little institutional testing and the NCAA does the least amount of testing in Division III.

The second question: Drug use is highest among African-American student-athletes. True or false? Survey says, for all categories, African-Americans have the low or were tied for the low among all categories listed, especially things like smokeless tobacco. African-Americans were about a quarter of the white student-athletes.

Football has the highest rate of anabolic steroid use. Survey says football is number two. Water polo is first, followed by football, men's baseball, wrestling and women's field hockey. These are not higher percentages of any event, but you can see it's not just football when you think about anabolic steroids.

The other thing that was a little surprising, this looks at the sources of anabolic steroids. You can see that most of the people got it from teammates or other relatives. What disappointed me as a physician is that 13 percent got it from another physician besides their team doctor. This is something we have to work on as a medi-

cal profession because it's really unacceptable.

The majority of college athletes feel the need to "keep up by taking drugs." The survey says about 90 percent either disagree or strongly disagree with that statement and felt they did not have to do that. So student-athletes in the NCAA often get painted unfairly by saying they're all taking drugs when in reality it's not true.

Marijuana is the most commonly used recreational drug. What do you think the number one is? Alcohol is number one; 80 percent have used it in the past year. But marijuana was second, about 28 percent. Followed by smokeless tobacco and psychedelics. You can see that steroids are only about 1.1 percent.

Ephedrine is mainly used as a recreational drug. What do you think? False? Well, the survey says false. Actually, 50 percent said they used it to improve their athletic performance. Our committee actually took this data, and because of this, we added ephedrine to our banned substance list in 1998. That's why we're looking forward to doing the survey again in 2001.

The last question is: Supplements are rarely used. I think we know the answer to this is probably false. We can see at this point creatine was used by 13 percent of the respondents. This was pre-Mark McGwire, so I would bet when we do the 2001 survey, it'll be much, much higher.

I give you these data in order to show you some of the information of average student-athletes. If you want the entire report, it's available from the NCAA. We'll be doing another one in 2001.

Let's talk about drug testing, because that's the other component in all this. Obviously, in the NCAA, we're talking about urine drug testing. In Division III testing policies, the NCAA only tests at championship events. We don't do any year-round testing at the Division III level, while we do at I and II.

The NCAA banned list has different categories of use: stimulants; anabolic agents; substances banned from specific sports like alcohol and beta blockers were banned from rifle shooting; diuretics; street drugs; peptide hormone is like growth hormone; and then specific limitations like caffeine, testosterone and marijuana. Also banned are blood doping, local anesthetics for nontherapeutic reasons; manipulation of the urine sample; and you are allowed to use inhalation, like for asthma, but not in other ways.

The key thing that I want to bring up is that all these things were added to the banned list in the last two years: DHEA; Androstenedione; Androstenediol; 19-Norandrostenedione; and ephedrine. I'm going to talk about all of these in a minute. The common thing, in addition to the athletes who say, "Oh, I didn't know this was banned because the guy at the nutrition store told me it wasn't," is from athletic directors at institutions who say they didn't know these things were banned and we don't really have an education program to deal with this.

Just to give you the results of our 1998 NCAA drug testing, I'm

not going to go through all the last five years, but people tested positive and their eligibility was revoked and then some people do test positive but they are able to appeal it and continue to compete. Out of about 5,000 tests in the fall, we had about 40 positive; we run about 1 percent positive.

In summary, just to tell you what these people tested positive for, is 17 of these were nandrolone. Almost every single one of those—nandrolone is a steroid—was from taking supplements. Seventy were given positives because they didn't show up for the test. Five were for THC or marijuana. Both had increases in ratios, but again, most of these were from supplements. Three were boldenone, which is an anabolic steroid. Two were ephedrine, both supplements; stenozonal, an anabolic steroid; methandienone, which is also an anabolic steroid. So you can see that most of them are steroids with a little marijuana, and no cocaine in the last year.

The ones who were positive and were given their eligibility back, one was a no-show who turned out to have a legitimate reason. Then we had 17 with increased ratios, but these are what we call naturally occurring TE ratios; we retested them and then it turned out it wasn't a fact, so they were given their eligibility back. Just to tell you where these come from. In 1997-98 you can see in the championship bowl, we had 27 positive. In the year-round Division I football, 35; year-round I track and field was five; and year-round Division II football was 15. So there were about 82 out of about 10,000. So we had close to about 1 percent positive.

Let's talk about supplements because I think that's really what a lot of us need to know about. Supplements are out there, and before I go into the specific supplements, I want to review how we got to this situation and why you're hearing so much more about supplements now than five years ago. Even in the last month we've had a couple of cases—Bears quarterback Jim Miller was taking an over-the-counter steroid supplement and lost the last four games of his season. Here's somebody who had access to trainers, coaches, agents, all these people, and he still, according to the player, ran out of his normal supplement and went and got a cheaper one—this guy's making like \$400,000 a year.

In addition, the Phoenix Suns' Tom Gugliotta had a near-fatal seizure after taking a supplement. Again, this is a pro making millions of dollars a year. He got something from a friend and decided to take it and almost died on a team bus when he had a seizure.

Why are we having these problems? It can all be traced to the Dietary Supplement and Health Act of 1994. These are some excerpts from the act. I'm sorry for the legislation; I know you've been through a lot of that in the law few days. But I just need to give you a couple of highlights from this.

It was established to improve the health status of people of the United States and make people healthier. It should clarify that supplements are not drugs. The key is the burden of proof was put on

the FDA to prove that the product is unsafe before it can be removed. So things are put out there and then they can be removed. Finally, they are put out to establish labeling requirements. Another thing it says is—this is what's in the preamble to the dietary supplement act—that the nutritional supplement industry is an integral part of the U.S. economy, affects the cost and balance of trade, and the federal government should not take any action to slow the distribution of supplements.

Let's see how successful they've been. They put a definition of "A supplement is a product intended to supplement the diet..." As I go through some of these, you can determine whether these definitions are actually being met. It cannot be a conventional food and it must be labeled as a dietary supplement. In addition, the claims cannot be false or misleading. They may not claim a relationship to a disease or a health condition. You can't say, for instance, that this drug is to treat baldness, but you can say this is to promote healthy hair growth. You'll see they do this all the time.

Based on this, of all the supplements out there, the FDA took eight actions in 1998. You can see they're not really looking at this too closely. In addition, they said at the time only 54 percent of Americans use supplements. At the time in 1994, there were 600 supplement manufacturers and they had \$4 billion in annual sales. You can see that the supplement act was to increase the accessibility. What happened after that, in 1997, up to \$12 billion in sales. It's probably \$14 billion in sales now. So you can see since the dietary supplement act was legislated, it's almost been an avenue for these manufacturers.

The last quote I'll give you from this is from a Congressman from California who was the sponsor of the bill: "This legislation will ensure consumers access to all supplements on the market so long as they are not unsafe." How do you like that for Washington double-talk? He's not saying that these are actually the supplements that are safe—only the ones that are not unsafe.

I want to show you how this came down. Some of the claims that we see with supplements, and you'll hear this from athletes, are it's natural or not drugs and they're safer than pharmaceuticals. Here are some natural products: nicotine, marijuana, heroine, cocaine, digoxin and most of our powerful chemotherapy drugs all come from plants. I don't think that anybody would think that these things are natural or safe. Natural is not being safe.

In 1993 to 1998, there were 2,600 reports of serious problems, there were 100 known deaths from supplements. I'm going to talk in a minute about blue nitro, which is what caused the seizure in Tom Gugliotta. There's also a question of purity. There's a large variance between the brands, a large variance even within a certain brand, and even in certain bottles. How do we know this? I work at the UCLA Olympic drug-testing lab. We tested 26 pills. We sent one of our research assistants off to a nutrition store and had him get eight

different brands of Androstenediol. We took 26 pills out and analyzed them.

We put them into five categories. Category 1 is if the supplement contained between 90 and 110 percent of all ingredients listed on the label. As you can see, there's nothing that fit that category. Category 2 was supplements that contained less than 90 percent of at least one ingredient. We had seven brands that fell in that category. Category 3 was the supplements that contained an ingredient that was not listed on the label. That was two of them. Category 4 was if supplements were missing at least one ingredient. There were two of them. Then we tested to see if they contained more than 110 percent of at least one ingredient listed. There was one.

You can see that none of them fell in Category 1. Under the Dietary Health and Supplement Act, a dietary supplement is considered mislabeled if it doesn't contain the name of each ingredient and quantity and fails to identify the strength that the supplement was represented to have. You can see that based on the supplement act, every one that we picked off the shelf would have failed this test in this brand.

I want to talk about some specific sports supplements that we see athletes take. I'm not just talking theoretically; this is what athletes take. We had an athlete submit a list of all the things that they were taking. This is what one athlete was taking per week: ultimate orange; Cytomax, a cross between creatine and a transport system; ginseng; HMB; B complex; amino acid fuel; another B complex; Multi 2000 with herbs; and fossil fuel. We figured it out; even at wholesale cost, it's about \$60 per week. Does anybody want to guess what sport this athlete played? I heard swimmer. It was a women's cross country runner. So it's not just the football players who use; this was a female cross country runner.

Athletes are often saying how they don't have enough money to eat, things like that. Here's someone spending about \$60 a week minimum—if bought at wholesale—on these products. So you can see that this particular athlete had some very, very expensive urine. (Laughter) In taking multiple B complex, most of this is just being urinated right out.

Let's talk about some specific things. The first thing I want to talk about is creatine. Watch, Popeye's in big trouble. He's going to pop out of a can of creatine, gulp it down, and wam, he can clobber Bluto. So creatine has made its way into the comic pages of our paper.

What is creatine? Well, for those of you who don't know, it's amino acid. It was first identified in the 1800s, so this is not a new substance. It is synthesized in the liver, pancreas and kidneys. It's available in meats and fish. We all have about 125 micrograms of dry-muscle creatine. So there's a certain creatine that we have in our muscles. Once you saturate that, you can't add any more creatine. So once those banks are filled, the rest just gets urinated out.

You don't need to go to the nutrition store to get creatine. You can go to the local herring store and get lots of creatine, but most people don't like eating that much herring. But you can get it in meats and fish and other types of things. Because of this, depending on your diet, you may be getting plenty of creatine. That's why we're seeing big individual variations in creatine because whether creatine works or not depends on the bank of creatine in your body.

Some of the conclusions that we've come to with creatine is that it may be ergogenic or performance enhancing for repeated 60- to 30-second maximum cycle events. So if you're doing something that's up to 30 seconds, you have a one- or two-minute rest period in between, you go again, and you keep doing that, creatine may help. But you need a recovery period of 20 seconds to five minutes. It can be considered ergogenic for just a single bout or sprint because you need that recovery time for your body to resynthesize creatine. It may improve strength, but I would emphasize it may. It says ergogenic or for a single bout or for swimming. It does not benefit submaximals, so if you're not doing a fully maximal type of test, it's probably not going to be beneficial.

The No. 3 point is important. It's never been shown to be beneficial in a nonlaboratory setting. We could put people on an ergometer or on a cycle and have them do these repetitive-type things and show some benefit, but not in a nonlaboratory setting. Again, there's large individual variation. If you have a lot of creatine stores in your body to start with and you take extra creatine, it's probably not going to help. If you're a woman or a vegetarian who doesn't get maybe a lot of meat in your diet, creatine may benefit. Again, I stress it may.

Unfortunately, the only way to tell what your creatine stores are is to go under anesthesia, have a surgeon take a piece of your muscle out, get it analyzed at the lab, and then decide what your creatine stores are. Most people are not willing to do that.

In terms of adverse effects on creatine, it does cause weight gain via water retention. So a lot of weight that you're gaining is just water weight. There is no relation to muscle dysfunction. There used to be a lot of sayings that creatine caused cramps. It probably does not if you hydrate well. It probably is well tolerated by the GI tract. In the short-term use—I'd stress short-term, like 10 days—it does not seem to affect healthy kidneys. Although for people with diseased kidneys, it probably is not very good.

In the short term, it probably doesn't affect cardiac function. Because the brain and testicles make creatine and also have creatine receptors, it may affect the brain creatine. That's why we do see a lot of people who take creatine will complain of headaches. There may be potential fertility problems if you're taking long-term because the testicles manufacture creatine as well.

We do tell people you should avoid creatine before a workout. Now, people are taking creatine with a big sugar load. That's probably not a good idea. It doesn't have any effect on aerobic performance,

so that cross country runner we saw who was taking it, it probably was not helping her too much. The current loading dose is way too high. They talk about 20 or 40 grams of creatine at a time. You probably don't need that. Some of the literature does say that taking small doses, which is 1.5 grams per day, is probably safe. But that's about what you get in your diet. Your body makes about two grams of creatine a day naturally. If you're taking about two grams a day in your food, that's probably enough. Concerning safety, Eskimos eat about three grams a day and nothing has happened to them as far as we can tell.

I want to talk about Dr. Brian Smith, who is chair of our sports sciences committee. They did a survey at UNC in Chapel Hill on creatine use in their Division I program. They found that about 80 percent of creatine users had been recommended this item by someone else. This is not people all of a sudden figuring out maybe I should go take some creatine; it's recommended to them. Who is it recommended to them by? As you can see, it's coaches, athletic trainers, teammates and friends. People are relying not just on the physician or athletic trainer, they're looking to their friends or their teammates.

Interesting also, 48 percent of male athletes had used creatine in this survey versus 4 percent of females. One-third began using it in high school. That's what we see with a lot of our drug use, that a lot of them use in high school. So if you start intervening at the college level, you can't be doing primary prevention anymore; you already have to be doing secondary for people who have already been exposed to it.

Our committee has come up with a position on creatine. We do not recommend placing it on the banned list at this point; however, it should not replace good nutrition. We do recommend that creatine be a nonpermissible benefit. I know it doesn't affect Division III too much, but Division I is struggling with that right now. Division II and III have implemented this and it hasn't been a problem as far as we can tell. So we do not recommend that an institution give this out for a variety of reasons.

Let's talk about some of the things that Mark McGwire made popular; some of the dietary supplements that are known as anabolic steroid precursors. This is a quote from Mark McGwire in 1998: "It's something that's legal and if you use it safely and responsibly, there's no problem. I just think it's really unfair for me to have to defend using something that's perfectly legal and allowed by Major League Baseball." That was 1998. One year later: "I elected to stop using Androstenedione because I don't need it. I got tired of having my name associated with it as if I were endorsing it. I got tired of young kids associating my name with it." I wish he would have said that the year before. It would have helped us all a lot.

What was he taking? These are the things that we talk about when we talk about steroid precursors: DHEA, Androstenedione, Androstenediol, 19-Norandrostenedione. For those of you who hated

chemistry, I apologize for this, but it's necessary. If you look at the bottom left, his testosterone, that's the testosterone molecule. All these other things, especially the top row, are all the supplements. It doesn't take an organic chemist to see that these are very closely related.

Nandrolone is our old friend the anabolic steroid. Right above that is 19-Norandrostenedione, which is about one carbon different than the nandrolone. What happens is that DHEA is converted to Androstenedione in your body. Androstenedione converts to testosterone. DHEA can also get converted to Androstenediol, which goes to testosterone.

So people got the idea that if testosterone is banned and I can't buy it because it's a controlled substance, what if I take a precursor? So we're giving people Androstenedione that gets converted to testosterone. The bottom line is if you wouldn't take testosterone because you're opposed to it or you don't think it's healthy, why would you take something it's converted to?

When you see this cascade that goes from DHEA to Androstenedione into testosterone, at each phase various other substances are siphoned off. Let's say you take 100 milligrams of DHEA, you don't end up with 100 milligrams of testosterone. You get little side chains, so maybe a couple of milligrams is testosterone. That's why if you take a little bit of DHEA, you can get a little bit of testosterone; take a lot of it, you get a little bit more. You know the athlete who we all work with believes if a little is good, then more is better.

DHEA is a very weak androgen. It is produced in the adrenal glands and is sold as a supplement because it's found in wild yams. If you're not eating a lot of wild yams, you're taking a whole lot of this stuff. Athletes, instead of taking maybe a small amount like they're advertising, 50 to 100 milligrams, they're taking 300 milligrams, 500 milligrams, or even 1,000.

Androstenedione is what Mark McGwire was taking. He talks about how this is a natural substance. This natural substance was invented by the East Germans in the 1960s as a nasal spray to circumvent Olympic drug testing. That's how natural it is. It's marketed as a natural testosterone. It's banned by the NCAA and the IFC.

If you take enough of it, you get an increased testosterone ratio and you get a positive drug test. This is not just theoretical. From our lab we've taken people, given them the supplement, watched it go through their kidneys, analyzed it, and it turns out that when you do that, in the urine you get the metabolites of testosterone, just as if you had taken testosterone. Again, it depends on how much you take.

19-Norandrostenedione is very similar to Androstenedione except for one difference, instead of it getting converted to testosterone, it gets converted to the very potent anabolic steroid nandrolone. With nandrolone, less of it goes to estrogen. It's touted as a more potent anabolic steroid.

Some of the adverse effects of all these things are just the same

as if you took testosterone. There's an increased risk of prostate cancer; it raises your cholesterol; it can give you cardiac problems; and it can give you male pattern hair growth, especially in women. We don't know what the effect is going to be in adolescents because they're still growing, but we can assume it's not too good. We get a lot of hormones through adolescence. But it potentially has all the risks of anabolic steroid, in addition to the fact that you don't know what's in them because it's a supplement.

Your question from all of this, I'm sure will be, is why are people able to sell these in stores as nutritional supplements when they usually contain steroids? It has to do with the Anabolic Steroid Control act of 1990. In order for something to be an anabolic steroid, it has to be a molecular structure similar to testosterone. I think you all saw from that previous slide that this is very close to testosterone. It has to be pharmacologically related to testosterone, which it is. It can't be estrogen or progesterone or a female hormone, which it isn't. You also have to be able to demonstrate that it's muscle-building. That has not been demonstrated yet, so that's why they have been able to market this stuff. If they proved that it was muscle-building, it would be classified as an anabolic steroid.

There's a lack of scientific research on all of these things. I did this slide a couple of months ago, and since that time, there have now been two scientific papers on Androstenedione. They are not great papers, but at least they're out there. If you go to Web sites, punch in Androstenedione on Yahoo or AOL or something. There's 25,000 Web sites selling nandrolone. For 19-Norandrostenedione, it is six million. The information's out there on the Internet. People are selling it out of their basements, very successfully. But there's very little science on this.

The next supplement I want to talk to you about is ephedrine. It's also known as Ma Huang, ephedra, mini whites. It's not only found in diet pills, we also now find that it's found in teas, it's found in energy bars like the Power Bar. We had a person who tested positive who was taking an energy bar. It's called a Speed Bar. It has 300 milligrams of ephedrine and 150 milligrams of caffeine. That's being sold over the counter. This person tested positive for ephedrine.

Ephedrine is very rarely found in cold preparations. Cold preparations know that it has too many side effects so they don't use that. Ephedrine is a stimulant. If you take enough of it, you get anxiety, palpitation, insomnia and stomach upset. It's a potent stimulant if taken in high doses. In some of these diet pills, it is given in very high doses.

Ephedrine is banned by the USOC and IFC; it was banned by the NCAA in 1997. Just as importantly, it can be distinguished under drug testing from sudafed, phenylpropanolamine. So we'll have people on appeals calls say they just took a cold tablet. We'll say probably not because that contains sudafed and you tested positive for ephedrine. So ephedrine can be distinguished.

Gammahydroxybutyrate is the next one. This one is used by body builders. It's also known as the date rape drug. It comes in a variety of different formulations. It's been marketed by body builders since 1990. It can increase muscle mass.

Just to give you an idea as to what the signs of stimulants are based on, I just use this one as an example. GHB was used to treat narcolepsy. It was a very rare sleeping-type disease. People with narcolepsy, if given GHB, get more delta-wave sleep. Delta-wave sleep is the time when growth hormone is made while you're sleeping. So these geniuses who take this thing said GHB increases delta sleep. Delta sleep increases growth hormone, so GHB increases growth hormone. That's what it's based on. That's only in people with narcolepsy. It's never been done in people who have normal sleep function. That's the whole basis of GHB.

It's dangerous. Fifty-seven people had acute illnesses from GHB in the mid-90s. Nine patients had to be on ventilators. There were some very, very serious types of problems. We're also having people start using these precursors. So instead of using GHB, because that got banned, people are using a precursor so it gets converted to GHB. In Texas, there were 55 serious reactions, 19 people with seizures, and one death—five of these were kids under 18. The FDA finally put an alert onto GHB. So it's a very dangerous substance if people fool around with it.

To finish and tell you the supplements that are banned by the NCAA—DHEA is banned because of increased testosterone ratio. Androstenedione and diol also get converted to that. 19-Norandrostenedione, which is nandrolone, also is banned. Ma Huang or ephedrine. Caffeine is banned above 12 and 15 micrograms. How much is that? If I drink a cup of coffee, will I get banned? No. You need to drink about eight to 10 cups of strongly brewed espresso about an hour before your event. So we're not talking about recreational use. You might think no one could drink that much coffee. You probably couldn't, but things like No-Doze contain about 100 milligrams of caffeine. If you took about eight to 10 No-Doze, you would get there pretty quickly.

To summarize, these supplements are questionable for quality control. They're relatively high cost for what you get. You can get most of this stuff out of your diet much cheaper. There's very little scientifically controlled studies. The theoretical benefits have not been demonstrated, but the bottom line is they're probably innocuous at best and they're probably also innocuous at least. Again, this is taken in small doses. The problem comes when people take three, four, five or 10 times the dosage recommended. Then they're probably not so innocuous.

Division III policy on nutritional supplements is that supplements are not a permissible benefit and our committee definitely agrees with that. Division I is having a little more problem with that right now. Why should we care about supplements? Number one is

safety. We had an appeal recently where a strength coach, unbeknownst to the athletic director, who found out on the appeal call, was giving out a supplement. Unless you can verify exactly what's in that supplement, I would not give it out.

Let's say you have somebody with a little bit of kidney disease and you give him tons of creatine. If that person develops kidney failure, it could be your liability. In addition, there's drug-testing issues. You could be giving somebody something that inadvertently contains a banned substance—the legal liability we've talked about. There's also the negative publicity about testing positive for your institution.

Our committee recommends a minimum standard for drug-education programs. We recommend that each institution review and develop individual team policies with alcohol and drugs. You should develop athletic department policies. You should review the institutional drug and alcohol policy. Review your conference policy if they have one and any conference or institutional drug-testing policy. In addition, we recommend that all institutions review the NCAA alcohol, tobacco and drug policy, including the ban on smokeless tobacco, the list of banned drugs, and the testing protocol.

We have an NCAA video that goes through the drug-testing protocol. We recommend that all institutions have their athletes view this. We recommend that you discuss nutritional supplements and tell them to check with somebody in the athletic department before you take anything. Allow time for questions and answers for the athletes.

Where are we going with this testing? We are proposing year-round testing for Division I baseball and swimming. Baseball has a high use of steroids, almost as high as football. The swimming coaches in Division I asked for more testing. We're going to start doing carbon isotope ratio testing, which is a way of more specifically testing for testosterone and to tell whether it's athlete testosterone or manufactured testosterone.

We want to find a better detection of supplements. We don't know where we're going with creatine. There may be a test for creatine at some point in the future or we may come to agree that creatine is okay to use. There's still not enough information on that at this time. For Division III, we're looking into expansion of year-round testing for Division III football for next year. That is going to come from your analysis here.

You know that wrestlers are doing the weight certification. There's been some impetus to provide drug testing during that certification period to make sure that wrestlers aren't trying to meet those demands by using diuretics. So we may start doing drug testing for that.

We want to try to improve access to multimedia educational materials. The Internet project that's going to be going on-line here very soon is going to have all this information that student-athletes can access. We want to try to do more education, especially on supple-

ments. We have several projects that we're going to be meeting about next week to discuss and try to move forward.

I just want to tell you that with athletes, it's not so much what drug you're taking, it's intentionally doing it—someone like Mark McGwire, who had so many records.

But here's another example of an athlete who was taking epo, which is what the people in the Tour de France were taking. This guy was taking it because he was competing in the Transplant Olympics because he had lost a kidney. He had to have his kidneys transplanted and his kidneys weren't making it on their own so we had to give him that before the Transplant Olympics one year. This guy ran the mile in five minutes or so even after his kidney transplant. So you can see that it's not just the substance they're using, it's why they're using it.

Thank you very much for your attention. (Applause) We have about five minutes for questions. If anyone has questions, I'd be happy to answer or I'll stick around for a little bit if people have questions to ask.

Leon Lunder (Carlton College): I was curious about the access of this presentation at any point.

Dr. Green: I don't know the answer to that.

Dan Dutcher (NCAA Staff): The transcript will appear in the Convention Proceedings when they're published in the spring.

Dr. Green: I guess I answered all your questions. I'll hang around the front if anybody has any questions they'd like to ask. (Applause)

Ms. Die: Many thanks, Dr. Green, for making the time to review this most important issue with us today. It may not be that we have no questions, it may be you provided so much information that we need to think and reflect before we come back with questions. I hope this discussion has opened some eyes and raised our consciousness regarding athletic performance enhancements. I urge all of us to continue this discussion when we return to our own campuses and our own conferences.

Our next discussion deals with the public perception of the NCAA. This issue is important not only because we are all members, it also is important because the public often paints with a very broad brush when it comes to its perception of intercollegiate athletics. As you heard yesterday, enhancing the public identity of Division III is a key goal in our strategic plan. The Association recently has completed an important study that has helped us achieve this goal, but much work remains. You will hear about this in the next few minutes. Here to lead our discussion today are Danita Edwards, NCAA vice-president for public affairs, and Wally Renfro, the NCAA's director of public relations.

NCAA PUBLIC RELATIONS STUDY AND PLAN DISCUSSION

Danita Edwards (NCAA Staff): Good morning and thanks so

much for this opportunity. I'm going to be very brief and get the process started by talking about the research that has launched the public affairs plan. I'll give you the general overview as to why we need to move forward with this plan.

I'm very pleased to tell you that we moved forward on what we think is a pretty good working draft of the plan. Certainly key to this plan will be input that we receive from you. We want to use this opportunity to start the process by giving you some background. I'll then come back and talk a little bit more about the plan. We'll talk specifically about how the plan relates to your Division III strategic plan and then we'll open things up for questions and answers.

Let me introduce Wally.

Wally Renfro (NCAA Staff): Thank you, Danita. Danita and I have made this presentation a number of times, but I have to say this is a special one this morning because this is really the first opportunity that we have had to present to a significant number of the membership and it helps begin to make this real for us. We've lived with this for a number of months and worked on it hard. But it's been within kind of a vacuum of the public affairs staff, so this is really a good opportunity for us to start putting some daylight on this and we're very pleased to do that.

As we have looked at the public affairs plan with the understanding that we're moving toward the centennial of the Association in 2006, as Ced talked about Sunday in his state of the Association speech, we believe that the public affairs plan should be a part of that total effort to prepare for the NCAA's next century. In doing that, I want to give you a little bit of an environmental overview that we have contemplated as we have worked on the plan.

We've really been asking the question for a number of years, whether we realized it or not, really for the last five years, we've been asking the question: What should the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics be like in its second 100 years? I think that's an important question for us to ask and it certainly is one that's fitting for this particular effort. We've been engaged in a number of key initiatives during that period of time. Probably one of the most important certainly was the restructuring of the Association's governance structure. That was important in lots of ways but certainly was important for the purpose of establishing the leadership of college presidents over this particular enterprise and this endeavor on campus.

We think that the move to Indianapolis of the national office was an important component in preparing for our second 100 years, certainly symbolically it is important. President Dempsey wanted to make sure that we came here in a building that had a much more open environment, one that was more open for the staff itself but one that was also more open in terms of how we are received, how we relate to the membership. We certainly wanted to make the national office building a meeting place for the membership, and we believe we've done that. And we know that over the next few months and

years, you're going to get an opportunity to see that for yourself. We hope that you're going to be very pleased with your new home and that's really what we want it to be.

On Sunday, Ced spent a lot of time on the state of the Association speech talking about the Executive Committee retreat that took place in October and the four goals that came out of there. We think that that was an awfully important part of getting ready for the Association's second 100 years. Those things are all initiatives that now we have completed. There are a couple of others that are in the process, certainly evolving.

The formal strategic planning process has been a major part of that whole plan. Division III has been a leader in that. That's a process that we have tried to make sure that we've examined as we have prepared the public affairs plan.

Then finally, of course, the initiative that we're here to talk about today, developing a plan for the Association and for intercollegiate athletics that addresses perception. We think this is important not only for the perception of the NCAA and college sports in general, but the impact on higher education because that is the environment in which we operate and it's one we try to be mindful of on a continual basis.

We started with some research, and we're going to spend some time talking about that this morning. We brought in two companies, Lou Harris & Associates and Landor & Associates, to help us with that. Harris is a company that we've used before. They're a well-known company and brought a level of reliability and validity, we believe, to the research that's important. Landor is important because Landor is a company that is really internationally famous for helping organizations, especially in terms of developing a graphic image of an organization.

We asked the researchers to start with the NCAA mission. We talked often as we have developed this plan about the integration of intercollegiate athletics into the mission of higher education, the integration of the student-athlete into the student body. I hope you heard remarks in Ced's state of the Association speech on Sunday, that maybe you understand how important that is.

We talked about that piece of the mission that isn't, frankly, often talked about, retaining the clear line of demarcation between intercollegiate athletics and professional sports. We believe that that is one of the things that makes college sports very unique. The process of participating in athletics while you're pursuing an education is unique in sports. It's unique in all sports, really all across the spectrum, and it certainly is one of the things that sets college sports in America apart from any other kind of experience throughout the world.

We told the researchers that inherent to what we're doing is that the competitive athletics programs of member institutions should be a part of the educational system, and that's how we wanted to engi-

neer the plan and how we wanted to have them help us prepare for that. So the research challenge really was to create an empirical foundation that would help us bridge the gap between the NCAA mission statement, how we want to be perceived as an entire enterprise, the Association and college sports, and in fact how the organization is perceived by external and internal constituents.

Let me talk just a minute about the respondents. We asked the surveyors to develop a respondent list that included those individuals who we thought were key to influencing the perception of the Association. Obviously, that included internally. By internal we meant folks in the national office as well as a long list of individuals on campus and in the conferences, and we'll talk about that in more detail in a minute. So we had almost 1,900 respondents in that category. There were about 1,300 in the general public selected by Harris and Landor, and a little over 200 in the print and electronic media business. Almost 3,400 interviews altogether were conducted.

This has got a lot of detail on it. The respondent list for internal constituents broke out in this fashion. We did about 60 percent in Division I, 20 percent in Divisions II and III, and you can see we had representatives, we believe, from all of the important influence groups within the internal constituency: presidents, commissioners, athletics directors, coaches, senior woman administrators and faculty reps. And for the first time this time, we've done this sort of research before, we also included SIDs and student-athletes. We think that that made it a much more rich and full research piece than we have done in the past.

I know that you're going to be interested in how Division III measured up in your responses compared to the other two divisions. I don't have a detail matrix to give you today because quite honestly we're still in the process of trying to analyze all that on a division-by-division basis. Our first chore was to take all of it and develop a plan from the total picture. We will be giving all that detailed information to the three chiefs of staffs in each division, and I know that they will be mining that research for information that is important to each of the three divisions.

But let's talk for just a moment about some of the things that we identified as we looked at the research with regard to Division III responses. Generally speaking, Division III was in line with all the other divisions on the major issues, the ideals, what is the ideal set of priorities, the ideal set of descriptor words for an organization like the NCAA and in terms of how the NCAA is actually perceived. We also asked them to look at descriptive characteristics and at major themes.

We did identify a few areas where we thought that there were notable differences and things that we wanted to bring to you this morning, quite honestly on a fairly arbitrary basis. We chose a 7 percent or more difference where Division III took a slightly different look than the other two divisions.

The first place we'll talk about is where Division III added greater emphasis than the other two divisions. One of those certainly was giving academics the proper priority. I've got to tell you that was high, obviously, in all three divisions. It was very high in all three divisions. As we get into major themes you will see that. But Division III had it higher than the other two divisions. Protecting the interests of the student-athletes also ranked high. That's a theme that you heard again on Sunday in Ced's speech and that you heard was a part of the goals of the Executive Committee, to protect the interest of the student-athletes.

There were a couple of areas in which Division III gave less emphasis than the other two divisions, certainly in terms of importance of generating revenue. That was a theme or a priority that Division III saw as less important than the other two divisions. Also, Division III had less emphasis in terms of the importance of developing elite athletes. That's not a surprising piece of information. Division III has always been one that looked at participation as the guiding theme of competition, as opposed to the development of elite athletes.

In part of this, we asked the respondents to take a look at major problems facing intercollegiate athletics or the Association. There are a couple of areas where Division III took a little bit different view than the others. In terms of commercialism and commercialization of college sports, we asked all three divisions to give us some sense of how much they thought that had happened. Division III certainly thought that had greater significance than the other two divisions did.

I know that you've had some forums this week on Title IX. This was one area where Division III—this was summer of 1998—where the respondents of Division III identified Title IX compliance as less of a problem as they perceived it undoubtedly within their division than the other two divisions did.

We're going now to go right into the results of the research. I will have to tell you that not all are going to be things that we were happy to hear. Some of the information, in fact, was good news and we'll certainly talk about that as well. I told Danita as I was sitting here this morning that as we move into this research, my advice to you is to fasten your seatbelt; it's going to be a bumpy ride.

We asked the respondents to look at five areas, what should be the five areas of the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics. The internal and external constituents, across the board, everyone agreed that the number one priority should be keeping the interest of the student-athlete at the heart of NCAA decision making. However, they also agree across the board that that's an area where the Association is not doing as well.

We asked them to look at the focus on money and to give us some feedback in that area. Again, all three groups of respondents agreed that generating revenue for the Association and for member institutions should be a lower priority, but in fact, they believe that that's

where the NCAA spends most of its attention, even though the internal constituents understand and really do agree that the money is needed for providing participation opportunities.

We found that the NCAA is seen as generating enormous revenues, but few believe that those revenues benefit member schools or student-athletes. Quite honestly, the thing that we found most often is that they simply don't have a good understanding, in all three respondent groups, including our own membership, of where the money goes and how it's used to benefit student-athletes or to help support the participation opportunities on campus.

Obviously, we asked the respondents to take a look at enforcement. Everyone agreed that it's important for all schools to follow the same rules to make sure we have fair play and competitive equity, but large portions of all groups believe that most major college programs violate NCAA rules on a regular basis and the constituent group that believed that the most were student-athletes. As Ced has mentioned a couple of times, that leads us to a couple of conclusions. One is that they may in fact not fully understand what the rules are and may believe that things that they perceive as violations are not. The other possibility, of course, is that there are lots of major violations.

I told you that there was some good news. Even within the good news I think that there are things that we have to pay attention to. The respondents said that the NCAA is seen as doing well at providing excellent competition and embracing the competitive spirit and supporting the individual achievement. Again, I think all of those are things that we all really got into intercollegiate athletics for in the first place. That's what we like about sports in general. But we also know that that competition, that drive, is the thing that has led us to an awfully lot of legislation to assure that we have a level playing field, to assure that we have competitive equity. So even within this context of good news, I think there are things that we have to be mindful of.

So the NCAA is seen as succeeding in its high-profile priority of revenue generating and in a competitive role, but failing at low-profile priorities deemed as deserving greater attention, specifically protecting the interest of student-athletes.

We know that there may be in fact those of us who work in it on a daily basis, know that there is a distinction between perception and reality, which is difficult to bridge because of the lack of positive media coverage and that, of course, is one of the reasons we're in the process of developing this plan.

We asked the respondents to look at descriptive characteristics of the ideal organization like the NCAA and how they perceive the NCAA to be. The word that came up most often across the board was that the NCAA is a powerful institution. The media and the public, and we know that Division III ranked this higher than the other two divisions, view the NCAA as commercialized. Across the board, the NCAA is not viewed as dynamic, open, or fair, even though those are

characteristics that all the respondents said are important to an ideal athletics administration organization.

One of the questions that we asked everyone, but we certainly asked the media, was where do you get your information about college sports? The thing that we discovered is that the media is where the media gets most of its information. That really means that we have this little feeding pool that's going on. Once you insert a piece of information into the media stream, that piece of information, whether it's right or wrong, becomes the standard throughout all of the media picture until that story has gone away.

The second most important source of information, and especially in terms of the media, are NCAA coaches. We know that they have the pulpit far more frequently than most of the rest of us have, just by the nature of what it is that they do. That's a point we're going to talk about more in a few minutes. Of all of the groups surveyed, the media has the most negative view of the NCAA. That's not surprising to any of us.

Critically, and it really is a critical issue, there is an absence of coverage on NCAA programs, how the NCAA helps student-athletes, especially in terms of how much money flows back to member institutions. That is a large part of what we have based our plan on, as you will learn when Danita begins talking about that plan.

So in general, when we look at the NCAA role in college sports, the highest priority should be protecting the interest of the student-athletes and enforcement. Both the public and the media believe that ensuring that all schools are following the same rules is very important to the NCAA. Safety and overall support of student-athletes also rise to the top, specifically in terms of ensuring that intercollegiate athletics have the time and support to complete their education, that we're protecting the safety of student-athletes, and that we're protecting their interest.

There is a disjoint between what should be the most important priority and in fact what people perceive is the most important priority. When we looked at importance versus delivery, which really measured the importance of objectives, and compared that with how well the NCAA is doing on reaching its goals, we saw similar views across all groups. The NCAA is doing a good job at providing a high level of competition, conducting championships and protecting the safety of its student-athletes. It's lacking in areas of enforcement, ensuring that there's proper time and emphasis on reaching educational goals, and protecting those interests.

All of that led us to the development of key messages and to the plan itself. Danita is going to spend some time with you talking about that, and then we'll open it up to questions and answers.

Ms. Edwards: Wally was right on the mark when he said there is good news and bad news. As we've gone through this research process, we realized that we had to hear that, however sobering it might be, in order to move forward. The research also allowed the re-

searchers to give us what they thought needed to be some of our key messages. There's one clear message. Wally referenced it before. The number one priority should be the total development of student-athletes. They're the leaders on the team, in the classroom, in the community and in society.

The image of the Association and the image of the campus are intertwined. All of intercollegiate athletics is painted by the same brush. We should say all of intercollegiate athletics should be painted by the same brush. But again, that's the type of talk we all really need, to tell you over and over again. We run into situations where either from our end or from a member institution end we're not making the connection that technically we are in fact one in the same. The NCAA is only as good as its membership is and vice versa. So that's a key message.

Another key message. We serve student-athletes. There are more than 335,000 student-athletes who work hard and play hard in college this year. Those folks are the base of the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics, also higher education. What we're going to try to do with this plan, again it's still in draft form because we want to make sure that we get input, and sessions like this are a starting point for us to receive direct input from you, is develop strong alliances for better collaboration and positive change. We want to collaborate more with campus and conference leaders. We want to develop close relationships with coaches to support our goals. Wally talked about the influence that coaches have. In reference to the research, coaches were at some point referred to as power coaches, which shows you the amount of influence those folks have.

Start telling the NCAA story on the local level. That means that we all have to make sure to be connected with this concept of the NCAA being its membership and vice versa, and then make sure that the stories you tell are not only consistent, but stories that began at the member institution level and then worked their way either around or up.

Engage the perception issue on a number of fronts. Establish a communication network that delivers key messages on point and on time. In just a minute I'm going to go through the plan and talk about some of the ways we'd like to do that.

Provide the media with information the media needs to paint an accurate picture of the NCAA. We want the media to come to either you all or to our management office or to any representative of the NCAA, not to go to themselves, as we discuss what needs to happen with our Association.

Engage the NCAA and our corporate partner leaders as champions of the Association, and develop a powerful advertising campaign that delivers the NCAA message to the public. That advertising campaign will need to also include general public service announcements about what the NCAA does, not public service announcements for advertisements specifically related to championships. So that's a big

change for us and also will have a pretty heavy financial impact.

We have to do the right thing and we have to tell what we're doing right. I'd like to stop there and just give you a little bit more detail specifically about what we've done so far with the public affairs plan.

We've come forward with three different goals. Our first goal is to present a new and consistent public image of the NCAA. Consistent is key there. So with launching a public affairs plan, it hopes to begin by developing its key messages, building from the ones I've just shared with you, implementing those in all of our NCAA communications, and then previewing the plan, as we're trying to do today, with not only our staff, but committees, divisional governance structure, and then representative constituent focus groups.

We have enlisted the assistance of a public relations firm not to tell us how to do this plan, per se, but really to validate where we've gone in terms of developing specific guidelines of the plan. I'm really pleased to tell you that all along I believed as vice-president that we had the expertise in house at the national office to draft an effective public affairs plan. When we took the plan to the PR firm, they in fact validated that we had done a very good job and really felt like they didn't have much work to do. So that's something that you should feel very proud of as you think about the national office staff.

But first, they presented us with some feedback, nothing that really deviates from what we've put together, fortunately, but they have emphasized the need for us to have sessions like this. So we'll be talking with Dan and we'll be talking with Bridget. As we move forward, we'll be working with you on trying to figure out ways to integrate more input.

We also, as part of that first objective, need to make sure we incorporate the NCAA messages into our significant business relationships and events. That sounds like something we just ought to do automatically. We've done a pretty good job of doing that over the years, but we've not necessarily focused on consistency. So we'll be making sure our messages are consistent and you'll be seeing certain key messages, like the ones we spoke about, over and over again, and perhaps even coming up with an NCAA tag line that would explain to someone who doesn't know about the NCAA exactly what we do.

The second goal is to increase the understanding of the NCAA and what's most influential in shaping perceptions of intercollegiate athletics, and that includes preparing our national office staff to assume a leadership role, using our Presidents Advisory Team, which reports to Ced, to get those folks prepared to share messages. But I'm also going to ask you all from time to time to be available to help us tell messages, focusing again on that local level and, if necessary, utilizing you on a much broader level.

A communications network that consistently delivers key messages on point and on time. It sounds like another argument that just goes without saying and, in fact, it does. However, the point

there that we're trying to make is that we've got to communicate as quickly as we can and as efficiently as we can. So we're going to focus more on electronic communications as hopefully a more effective way to get messages out. We've done some of that in the past.

You all have seen our page on the Web and have noticed improvements already with the page. However, we want to look at our publications and make sure we can get messages out more quickly by making our publications electronic and, if necessary, a hard copy of the publication as well as an electronic copy. That's just one example. In general we'll also be making sure that our electronic communication or our on-line communication meets your need. A lot of you are very interested in having visual information up on the Web or on-line, so we'll be focusing on that and we'll be talking to people about that.

Back to the concept of engaging selected NCAA leaders as champions. Generally, when Wally has a crisis, he has two or three people on hand from our leadership to respond to the media. That's worked pretty effectively, but as we thought about this plan and how we might make it a much more effective, broad plan, we thought we needed to get a group of champions together from each division to assist us in telling messages.

That's going to require us to go out and spend a lot of time making sure that not only the staff understands the NCAA story, all the different stories there are to tell, but key people within each division understand that story so that when the time comes, we have this core of people who can assist us either in relaying information on a third-party basis or just going out with us to tell stories. So we're looking forward to that.

We also know that we're going to have to do a better job of providing the media with the information to convey an accurate picture of the NCAA. We already spend a lot of time working with the media, but we have some ideas that are a little more aggressive than those meetings in the past.

For example, we want to invite the media to come into the national office at different points throughout the year so that they'll have an opportunity to talk to our divisional representatives, those champions that I've just mentioned, for example, and also our staff, just to find out information about all that we do. We're certainly not limited to one division and we want to make sure the media understands that. Also, we're not limited to just information that appears to be negative when we have to focus on enforcement or regulatory activity.

Under that second objective, when the folks are collaborating with us from the campus and conference administrators in shaping our initiatives, that can be anything from regular opportunities for us to interact with conference and campus administrators to us actually working with sports information directors. The list goes on and on.

What I hope you see in terms of what we're trying to do so far with the plan is that we're really focused first and foremost on one-

to-one interaction. That will start not only on the staff level, but one-on-one interaction with our membership, just to make sure that we're all connected. Ultimately, that will turn into consistent messages that we all can understand and we all can use.

Because the coaches are so powerful, or viewed as so powerful from the research, we want to also develop more closer working relationships with college coaches. I talked about the one-on-one interaction. We're going to get out and do some of that as well, to make sure that coaches understand all that we need to share as part of the total NCAA story, and then also to make sure that we understand why they choose to take some of the directions that they choose in telling the information they choose to tell. So that will be a challenge.

The third goal focused on measuring the effectiveness of the public affairs program. Throughout this entire process—and I would like to add that the public affairs plan is not going to be a one-year plan or two-year or even a three-year plan; it is going to be a multiphase plan that at a minimum will take six years to implement. So throughout that entire process, over the six years, we will continue to measure the effectiveness of our program. We will be checking specific details and then will also be launching research like the research Wally mentioned to you just to make sure we're on track.

That probably, as I'm wrapping this up, is a good segue to say that in addition to the fact that this is a multiphase, multiyear kind of tool, it will also have to be extremely flexible. So when you see the version of the plan you see, please understand that in fact it is not locked in stone. We are trying to create a document that will be flexible enough to shift as we need to shift to respond to your needs and also to respond to national office staff needs. Somehow, we'll create a balance.

But since this is our first attempt, it's important for me to say we know the document is not going to be perfect the first time around. We'll just ask for your patience and we'll also ask for regular input from you to make sure that this document serves all of our needs. Thank you so much for this opportunity. If you have questions, we'd be happy to try to answer them. (Applause)

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Die: Before they leave the platform, I want to thank Danita and Wally for that enlightening look at public affairs issues facing the Association and our division. We want to pledge that we will do all we can to assist you in getting the message of Division III out. I appreciate your work. Thank you.

We do face some significant challenges in the area of public affairs and public relations, and to be successful in the initiative by contributing fundamentally to improve our public perception and identity must begin with a commitment from the NCAA membership. I urge each of you to discuss and consider what you can do on your campus and in your conference to achieve that ambitious goal.

We will now open the window of reconsideration. I will again call on John Biddiscombe to preside over that process. John.

WINDOW OF RECONSIDERATION

Mr. Biddiscombe: President Die, the window of reconsideration is open. Seeing no speakers moving to the microphones, I will close the window of reconsideration. Thank you.

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Die: The window of reconsideration is officially closed. Thank you, John. Thank you, members. That concludes today's agenda. Are there questions? Are there issues members would like to bring aboard? I see no one at the microphone. I would be happy to entertain a motion to adjourn. It's been moved. It's been seconded. Any discussion? All in favor, say aye. Opposed, no. The motion passes. Please have a safe trip back. We look forward to seeing you next year.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 10:35 a.m.]

94th Annual Convention
LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS
SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.13, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption at the NCAA Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that were submitted with an immediate effective date are noted with an asterisk (*) by the effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1999-00 NCAA Divisions II and III Manuals.] All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 94th annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments-to-amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS
94th ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1	Executive Committee Proposal
2 through 48	Division II Legislative Proposals
2 through 12	Consent Package
13 through 34	Presidents Council Grouping
35 through 40	Recruiting
41	Eligibility
42 through 45	Playing and Practice Seasons
46 through 48	General
49 through 94	Division III Legislative Proposals
49 through 58	Presidents Council Grouping
59 through 79	Deregulation Package
80 through 83	Awards and Benefits
84 through 86	Playing and Practice Seasons
87 through 89	General
90 through 94	Consent Package

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PROPOSAL

NO. 1 (NO. 2-1) THE PRINCIPLE OF NONDISCRIMINATION

Intent: To amend the Principle of Nondiscrimination as specified and to permit each institution to determine its own policy regarding nondiscrimination.

[Note: The proposed change sponsored by the NCAA Executive Committee must be approved by two-thirds of the total membership (present and voting).]

Constitution: Amend 2.6, page 4, as follows:

[Dominant provision, all divisions, common vote]

"2.6 The Principle of Nondiscrimination. The Association shall promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person. It is the policy of the Association to refrain from discrimination with respect to its governance policies, educational programs, activities and employment policies, including on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, creed or sexual orientation. It is the responsibility of each member institution to determine independently its own policy regarding nondiscrimination."

Source: NCAA Executive Committee (Committee on Women's Athletics).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Currently, the Association's Principle of Nondiscrimination is generic in nature. This proposal would make the language in Constitution 2.6 more specific by prohibiting discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, gender, national origin, religion, creed or sexual orientation. Further, this proposal would permit each institution to determine its own policy regarding nondiscrimination. This proposal was developed with assistance from the NCAA's legal counsel.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division II chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division II Presidents Council for review. They cannot be

A-2

—Legislative Proposals

placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Presidents Council are those identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. All proposals in the Presidents Council grouping may be subject to a roll-call vote.

CONSENT PACKAGE

*NO. 2 (NO. 2-4) SELF-STUDY REPORT — DIVISION II

Intent: To require institutions that have completed the four-year provisional membership period to complete an institutional self-study in the first year of active membership.

Constitution: Amend 6.3.1 by adding 6.3.1.1, page 48, as follows:

[Division II]

"6.3.1.1 Institutions Completing Provisional Membership. An institution that completes the four-year provisional membership period and is granted active membership status must conduct a comprehensive self-study and evaluation of their intercollegiate athletics program no later than the end of the first year of active membership, regardless of when the previous self study was completed."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Currently, confusion exists regarding when a provisional member that is granted active status must complete a self-study evaluation. As a condition of provisional membership, an institution must complete an institutional self-study guide in year one of the four-year provisional membership period. The issue, therefore, has been whether or not the institution's "five-year clock" starts upon the completion of this institutional self-study guide or if the institution has five years from the date active membership is granted to complete the process. This proposal puts this confusion to rest and clearly establishes that the institution must complete the institutional self-study guide prior to the end of the institution's first year of active membership.

Action: Adopted.

Legislative Proposals

A-3

***NO. 3 (NO. 2-5) EXPENSES FOR PARTICIPATION IN OLYMPIC EXHIBITIONS**

Intent: To permit individuals to receive actual and necessary expenses to participate in Olympic tours/exhibitions involving Olympic team members and members of the national team.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.1.1.4.3 by adding new 12.1.1.1.4.3.1, pages 60-61, as follows:

[Division II]

"12.1.1.1.4.3.1 Expenses for Participation in Olympic Exhibitions. Expenses received from the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or national governing body (NGB) to participate in Olympic tours or exhibitions involving Olympic team members and/or members of the national team, provided that if the individual is a student-athlete, he or she misses no class time and the exhibition does not conflict with dates of institutional competition."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.1.1.4.5 by adding new 12.1.1.1.4.5.1, page 61, as follows:

[Division II]

"12.1.1.1.4.5.1 Expenses for Participation in Olympic Exhibitions. Actual and necessary expenses to participate in Olympic tours or exhibitions from a sponsor other than the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC), national governing body (NGB) or nonprofessional organizations sponsoring the event, provided that if the individual is a student-athlete, he or she misses no class time and the exhibition does not conflict with dates of institutional competition."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Under current NCAA amateurism regulations, individuals may receive actual and necessary expenses from an outside amateur sports team or organization or nonprofessional organization only to participate in actual competitions (i.e., events that involve either competition against an outside team or the scoring of actual place finish in the event). This proposal will permit individuals to receive actual and necessary expenses to participate in Olympic tours/exhibitions involving Olympic team members and members of the national team, even if the activities include no formal competition, provided that if the individual is a student-athlete, he or she misses no class time and the exhibition does not conflict with dates of institutional competition. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes that this proposal is consistent with other more permissive NCAA amateurism rules governing other USOC or NGB activities.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 4 (NO. 2-6) AMATEURISM - DEVELOPMENTAL TRAINING EXPENSES**

Intent: To permit currently enrolled student-athletes (as well as prospective student-athletes) to receive funding to cover actual and necessary developmental training expenses that are approved by the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or appropriate national governing body (NGB).

Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.4, pages 61-62, as follows:

[Division II]

[12.1.1.4.1 through 12.1.1.4.3 unchanged.]

"12.1.1.4.4 Exception for Training Prior to Collegiate Enrollment Expenses. Prior to initial, full-time collegiate enrollment, *aAn individual (prospective or enrolled student-athlete)* may receive actual and necessary expenses [including grants but not prize money, whereby the recipient has qualified for the grant based on his or her performance in a specific event(s)] to cover developmental training, coaching, facility usage, equipment, apparel, supplies, comprehensive health insurance, travel, room and board without jeopardizing the individual's eligibility for intercollegiate athletics, provided such expenses are approved and provided directly by the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or the appropriate national governing body (NGB) in the sport (or, for foreign student-athletes, the equivalent organization of that nation). Subsequent to college enrollment, the receipt of such expenses must be consistent with the requirements set forth in 12.1.2 and 16.11.1.4.

"12.1.1.4.5 Exception for Developmental Training Programs. An individual may receive actual and necessary expenses for developmental training programs conducted and supervised at any time of the year by the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or the appropriate national governing body (NGB) (or, for foreign student-athletes, the equivalent organization of that nation), even if the programs include no competition, provided the individual misses no class time and the program does not conflict with dates of institutional competition."

[12.1.1.4.6 through 12.1.1.4.9, renumbered as 12.1.1.4.5 through 12.1.1.4.8, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Current NCAA amateurism legislation prohibits currently enrolled student-athletes from accepting funding from the USOC to cover developmental training expenses unrelated to participation in a specific competition. The USOC provides funding in the form of a modest grant with the intent that it will be used to pay for equipment, room and board, travel and other essential items; however, due to personnel constraints, the

USOC does not require an accounting of the funds. Enrolled student-athletes need this funding primarily while on a leave of absence from their collegiate institution to train during an Olympic year. This proposal will make it feasible for student-athletes of limited means to pursue national and Olympic team training without jeopardizing their athletics eligibility while still maintaining the Association's amateurism principles.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 5 (NO. 2-9) DE MINIMIS VIOLATIONS — REPORT DISTRIBUTION

Intent: To specify instances in which a de minimis violation will not render a prospective or enrolled student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

Bylaws: Amend 13.3.1.2, page 88, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.3.1.2 Report Distribution. Member institutions shall provide to prospects and to prospects' parents the information contained within the report. The NCAA shall provide a compilation of graduation data to the prospect's guidance offices and high-school and two-year college coaches. The information shall be provided at the earliest opportunity after the institution's first arranged in-person encounter with the prospect or upon request; however, in no event shall an institution provide the information later than the day prior to a prospect's signed acceptance of the National Letter of Intent or signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility.**"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is similar to those adopted at recent NCAA Conventions and represents an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare a student-athlete ineligible as a result of a violation where the student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurred.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 6 (NO. 2-12) DE MINIMIS VIOLATIONS — UNOFFICIAL VISIT TRANSPORTATION

Intent: To specify instances in which a de minimis violation will not render a prospective or enrolled student-athlete ineligible while

retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.3, page 92, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.6.3 Transportation on Unofficial Visit. During any unofficial recruiting visit, the institution may provide the prospect with transportation only to view off-campus practice and competition sites in the prospect's sport and other institutional facilities (located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus). An institutional staff member must accompany the prospect during such a trip. Payment of any other transportation expenses, including providing transportation to attend one of the institution's home contests (on or off campus), *shall cause the trip to become an official paid visit is not permissible.* For violations of 13.6.3 in which the value of the transportation is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e. prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is similar to those adopted at previous NCAA Conventions and represents an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare a student-athlete ineligible as a result of a violation where the student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurred.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 7 (NO. 2-14) RECRUITING PUBLICITY — CONTESTS INVOLVING NATIONAL TEAMS

Intent: To allow athletics department staff members to serve as announcers or commentators during national team events, including the Olympic games, regardless of whether there are prospective student-athletes involved in such competition.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.3.1, page 99, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.11.3.1 Announcer for High-School Broadcast. A member of

the athletics staff of a member institution may not serve as an announcer or commentator for a high-school, college preparatory school or two-year college contest, or appear (in person or by means of film, audio tape or videotape) on a radio or television broadcast of such contest. In Division III, this restriction applies only to members of an institution's coaching staff (e.g., full-time, part-time, volunteer). **This restriction does not apply to contests involving national teams in which prospective student-athletes may be participants, including the Olympic games."**

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Olympic Sports Liaison Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Currently, Bylaw 13.11.3.1 prohibits coaches and other staff members from serving as announcers or commentators at high-school contests. By interpretation, this bylaw has been expanded to include all contests in which a prospect may be a participant. There is a vast difference between regulating coaches participating in the broadcast of "high-school contests" and prohibiting their serving in that capacity at any contest in which a prospective student-athlete is participating. It does not seem likely that the intent of the original legislation was to limit the outside activities of coaches in circumstances totally unrelated to recruiting, and this proposal would exclude national team events such as the Olympic games from the application of the legislation.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 8 (NO. 2-16) DE MINIMIS VIOLATIONS - FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT - DIVISION II**

Intent: To specify instances in which a de minimis violation will not render a student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.6.1, page 117, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.1.6.1 Requirement for Practice. To be eligible to participate in organized practice sessions, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as defined by the regulations of the certifying institution. **A violation of this bylaw shall be considered an institutional violation per Bylaw 2.8.1; however, it shall not effect the student-athlete's eligibility.**"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This de minimis proposal, similar to those adopted in previous years, is an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare a student-athlete ineligible as a result of a violation where the student-athlete or prospective student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurred. Currently, violations of this bylaw result in immediate reinstatement of eligibility without conditions imposed. The institution will still be held accountable for any institutional responsibility regarding a violation of these regulations.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

***NO. 9 (NO. 2-21) DE MINIMIS VIOLATION - DECLARATION OF DEGREE PROGRAM - DIVISION II**

Intent: To specify instances in which a de minimis violation will not render an enrolled student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.1.4 by adding new 14.4.3.1.4.2, page 130, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.4.3.1.4.2 Effect of Violation. Violations of 14.4.3.1.4 shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal, similar to those adopted at previous NCAA Conventions, is an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare a student-athlete ineligible as a result of a violation where the student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurred. Currently, violations of this proposal results in immediate reinstatement of eligibility without conditions imposed. The institution will still be held accountable for any institutional responsibility regarding a violation of Bylaw 14.4.3.1.4 (designation of degree program) and 14.4.3.1.4.1 (documentation of degree-program designation).

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

***NO. 10 (NO. 2-23) FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS - DISCONTINUED ACADEMIC PROGRAM EXCEPTION**

Intent: To allow an institution to grant a discontinued academic pro-

gram exception instead of submitting the request to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.4, page 140, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.5.5.3.4 Discontinued Academic Program Waiver Exception. *The Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement concludes that the certifying institution concludes that the student changed institutions in order to continue a major course of study because the original institution discontinued the academic program in the student's major."*

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Currently, the NCAA Student-Athlete Reinstatement staff on behalf of the Division II Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee determines whether this waiver should be granted. The committee believes that the certifying institution could easily analyze such matters. Further, the committee believes that by allowing the certifying institution to process this exception the legislation would be handled more efficiently.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 11 (NO. 2-35) SCHEDULING REQUIREMENTS — GEOGRAPHICAL WAIVERS**

Intent: To establish deadlines for submitting waiver requests related to Division II scheduling requirements in football and men's and women's basketball.

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.4.3.4, page 307, as follows:

[Division II]

"20.10.4.3.4 Geographical Waiver—Division II Football. The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the provisions of 20.10.4.1 for a Division II institution that does not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football, or which offers fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II football, if it is determined that fewer than six other Division II football programs exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus that do not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football or offer fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II football. An institution shall calculate the applicable percentage based upon the amount of athletically related financial aid received by its student-athletes in the sport of football as opposed to including all institutional aid in that sport. **Such a waiver request must be received in the national office not later than June 15 immediately following the academic year in which the scheduling requirement was not met."**

B. Bylaws: Amend 20.10.4.4 by adding new 20.10.4.4.3, pages 307-308, as follows:

[Division II]

[20.10.4.4.1 and 20.10.4.4.2 unchanged]

"20.10.4.4.3 Submission Deadline. Waiver requests pursuant to 20.10.4.4.1 and 20.10.4.4.2 must be received in the national office not later than June 15 immediately following the academic year in which the scheduling requirement was not met."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The submission date identified in this proposal is necessary to provide a more definitive process for requesting waivers of the Division II scheduling requirements. It is difficult, under current legislation, for the Membership Committee to objectively evaluate a waiver request that is retroactive to previous academic years. This proposal sets an objective standard so that all waiver requests may be administered consistently and can be reviewed by the Membership Committee based on the circumstances of the situation and not on the submission date.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

***NO. 12 (NO. 2-36) NCAA FOREIGN-STUDENT RECORDS COMMITTEE**

Intent: To establish a standing common foreign-student records committee to assist in reviewing initial-eligibility standards for international students.

[Note: The proposed changes involve common provisions, and thus, must be approved by Divisions I and II acting independently.]

Bylaws: Amend 21.5 by adding 21.5.5, page 318, as follows:

[Common provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"21.5.5 NCAA Foreign-Student Records Committee

"21.5.5.1 Composition. The committee shall consist of nine members including three Division I representatives, three Division II representatives and three ex-officio members, one of which shall be the NCAA initial-eligibility clearinghouse's primary foreign-student records consultant.

"21.5.5.2 Duties. The committee shall assist in reviewing initial-eligibility standards for international students."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This committee will replace the foreign-student records consultants group that was formed years ago in order to establish consistent published initial-eligibility standards for international students. The creation of this new common committee was to eliminate concerns regarding the foreign-student records consultants group. Specifically, the foreign-student records consultants did not report to any entity within the NCAA governance structure and rendered untimely decisions relating to interpretive issues pertaining to a particular foreign student. Further, the consultants did not have a specific length of term or appointment on this group. With the adoption of this proposal, the Foreign-Student Records Committee would be an official part of the NCAA Divisions I and II governance structure and will report to the NCAA Division I Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet (Subcommittee on Initial-Eligibility Issues) and the Division II Academic Requirements Committee. Six of the members of this committee shall be from Division I and II institutions each of whom shall have current professional expertise in the area of foreign-student records. The additional three committee members will be ex-officio members who possess a broad foreign-student record knowledge base. Due to the highly technical nature of this work, committee members shall serve six-year terms.

Action: Adopted, effectively immediately.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

*NO. 13 (NO. 2-3) AMENDMENT PROCESS - EMERGENCY LEGISLATION

Intent: To establish authority for the Division II Presidents Council to adopt emergency legislation when appropriate.

Constitution: Amend 5.3.1.1 by adding new 5.3.1.1.2, page 35, as follows:

[Division II]

"5.3.1.1.2 Emergency Legislation. The Presidents Council may adopt "emergency" legislation that shall be effective immediately in situations when the NCAA must respond to, or comply with, a court, alternative dispute resolution (ADR) or government order or when the Presidents Council deems it appropriate to limit or avoid NCAA liability as a result of litigation, ADR or governmental proceedings. Such "emergency" legislation shall be adopted only by at least a three-fourths majority of the members of the Presidents Council present and voting. Further,

"emergency legislation" adopted by the Presidents Council must be ratified by the Division II membership at the next regularly scheduled NCAA Convention."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The Presidents Council should have authority to adopt "emergency legislation" in situations when the NCAA must respond to, or comply with, a court, alternate dispute resolution (ADR) or government order or when the Presidents Council deems it appropriate to limit or avoid NCAA liability as a result of litigation, ADR or governmental proceedings. Such legislation requires a three-fourths majority of the Presidents Council members present and voting. Such legislation may be effective immediately and must be ratified by the Division II membership at the next regularly scheduled NCAA Convention.

Action: Adopted, 203-1-0, effective immediately.

*NO. 14 (NO. 2-17) ELIGIBILITY - ADDITIONAL SEASON OF COMPETITION WAIVER

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to regain a season of competition when the student-athlete utilizes a season of competition prior to the determination of his/her eligibility status.

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 14.2.7, page 123, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.2.7 Season of Competition Waiver. In conjunction with a request for restoration of eligibility and any conditions imposed there on, per Bylaw 14.12, a student-athlete may be granted an additional season of competition by the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee when he or she participated in a limited amount of competition. *as a result of a good faith, erroneous formal declaration of eligibility by the institution's appropriate certifying authority.* The competition must have occurred under all of the following conditions:

- "(a) as a result of a good-faith, erroneous formal declaration of eligibility by the institution's appropriate certifying authority; or
- "(b) as a result of a student-athlete's good-faith, erroneous reliance upon a coaching staff member's decision to place the student-athlete into competition prior to the coaching staff member receiving a formal declaration of eligibility for the student-athlete from the institution's appropriate certifying authority.

[14.2.7-(a) through 14.2.7-(d) numbered as 14.2.7-(1) through 14.2.7-(4), unchanged.]

"(5) The student-athlete, in the case of a coaching

staff member's erroneous decision, had reason to believe he/she was eligible to participate, and the student-athlete did not contribute to the coaching staff member's erroneous decision to allow the student-athlete to participate."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)).

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This legislation is designed to provide relief to the student-athlete who relies upon the decision of a coaching staff member to allow the student-athlete to participate when final certification of the student-athlete's eligibility has not yet occurred or has not yet been received by the coaching staff member who makes the decision to allow the student-athlete to participate.

Action: Adopted, 164-42-2.

NO. 15 (NO. 2-19) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY - CORE CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS

Intent: To redefine a core course for purposes of meeting the initial-eligibility core-curriculum requirement, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 14.3.1.3, pages 124-125, as follows:
[Division II]

"14.3.1.3 Core-Curriculum Requirements. For purposes of meeting the core-curriculum requirement to establish eligibility at a Division I or II member institution, a "core course" is defined as a recognized academic course (as opposed to a vocational or personal-service course) that offers fundamental instructional components in a specified area of study. Courses that are taught at a level below the high school's regular academic instructional level (e.g., remedial, special education or compensatory) shall not be considered core courses regardless of course content. The prohibition against the use of remedial or compensatory courses is not applicable to courses designed for students with learning disabilities (see Bylaw 14.3.1.3.5). Effective with courses taken during the 1987-88 academic year and thereafter, at least 75 percent of the instructional content of a course must be in one or more of the required areas [as listed in (a) through (f) below], and "statistics," as referred to in the mathematics section, must be advanced (algebra-based). For courses taken during and prior to the 1986-87 academic year to be considered core courses, at least some instructional elements (as listed below) must be included. **must meet all the following criteria:**

"(a) English—(four years required in Division I and three years required in Division II). Core courses in English shall include instructional elements in the following areas: grammar, vocabulary development, composition, literature, ana-

lytical reading or oral communication. A course must be a recognized academic course and qualify for high-school graduation credit in one or a combination of the following areas: English, mathematics, natural/physical science, social science, foreign language, computer science or nondoctrinal religion/philosophy;

"(b) Mathematics—(two years required, including in Division I at least one year of algebra and one year of geometry (or one year of a higher-level mathematics course for which geometry is a prerequisite)). Core courses in mathematics shall include instructional elements in algebra, geometry, trigonometry, statistics (algebra-based) or calculus. A course must be considered college preparatory by the high school. College preparatory is defined for these purposes as any course that prepares a student academically to enter a four-year collegiate institution upon graduation from high school;

"(c) Natural or Physical Science—(two years required, including at least one full year of laboratory classes if offered by the high school). Core courses in natural or physical science shall include instructional elements in biology, chemistry, physics, environmental science, physical science or earth science. A mathematics course must be at the level of Algebra I or a higher-level mathematics course;

"(d) Social Science—(two years required). Core courses in social science shall contain instructional elements in history, social studies, economics, geography, psychology, sociology, government, political science and anthropology. A course must be taught by a qualified instructor as defined by the appropriate academic authority (e.g., high school, school district or state agency with authority of such matters); and

"(e) Additional Courses in English, Mathematics or Natural or Physical Science—(one year required in Division I and two years required in Division II). The year(s) of additional academic credit must be from courses in the above areas of English, mathematics or natural or physical science. A course must be taught at or above the high school's regular academic level (i.e., remedial, special education or compensatory courses shall not be considered core courses). However, the prohibition against the use of remedial or compensatory courses is not applicable to courses designed for students with learning disabilities (see Bylaw 14.3.1.3.5).

"(f) Additional Academic Courses—(two years required). The two remaining years of additional academic credit must be from courses in the above areas or foreign language, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion (e.g., comparative religion) courses."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Core-Course Review Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Through regular dialogue between the high-school community and the NCAA Core-Course Review Committee, secondary-school educators have expressed concerns that the current NCAA core-course definition (i.e., 75 percent instructional content) rather than high-school educators, is determining the content of high-school course offerings. In addition, representatives of more than a dozen national high-school agencies provided information at a recent committee meeting regarding the integrated and interdisciplinary curricula that is being used in many high schools. Based on input received from these high-school representatives and the committee's own experience with the application of the current core-course definition, the committee concluded that the 75 percent instructional-content requirement is inconsistent with the current state of high-school curricula. Members of the committee believe the proposed change is consistent with directives received from the Division II Presidents Council to give high-school principals primary responsibility for evaluating high-school course offerings in relation to NCAA core-curriculum standards. In addition, the committee believes the proposed change is consistent with current high-school reform movements and contains sufficient legislative safeguards to ensure that prospective students who successfully complete the core-curriculum requirements will be academically prepared to succeed at a four-year collegiate institution.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 16 (NO. 2-20) INITIAL ELIGIBILITY — CORE CURRICULUM REQUIREMENTS — NONTRADITIONAL COURSES

Intent: To permit independent-study courses, correspondence courses, Internet-based courses, distance-learning courses, individualized-instruction courses and courses taught by similar means to be used to meet the core-curriculum requirements, provided certain criteria are met.

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 14.3.1.3.2, page 125, as follows:
[Division II]

"14.3.1.3.2 Independent-Study or Correspondence Courses. Independent-study or correspondence courses may not be used to satisfy core-curriculum requirements. Nontraditional Courses. Courses taught via the Internet, distance-learning, independent-study, individualized-instruction, correspondence, and courses taught by similar means, may be used to satisfy NCAA core-course requirements if all of the following conditions are satisfied:

"(a) The course meets all requirements for a core course as defined in Bylaw 14.3.1.3;

"(b) The instructor and the student have access to one another during the duration of the course for purposes of teaching, evaluating and providing assistance to the student;

"(c) Evaluation of the student's work is conducted by the appropriate academic authorities in accordance with the high school's established academic policies; and

"(d) The course is acceptable for any student and is placed on the high-school transcript."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Core-Course Review Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000; for those student-athletes first entering a collegiate institution on or after August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The current legislation, which prohibits the use of independent-study and correspondence courses to satisfy the core-curriculum requirements, was adopted at a time when traditional classroom instruction was virtually the only method of instruction utilized by high schools. As such, the legislation does not specifically address distance learning or courses taught via the Internet, nor does it make a clear distinction between independent-study courses and courses taught via individualized instruction. At a meeting of the NCAA Core-Course Review Committee, representatives of more than a dozen national high-school agencies provided information regarding the quality and the varying types of secondary-education programs now being offered via the Internet, correspondence, independent-study, individualized-instruction and distance-learning courses. Based on the information received from these high-school representatives and the committee's own experience with alternative methods of delivering education, the committee and the NCAA Division II Academic Requirements Committee believe that many of these courses should be permissible to use to satisfy the core-curriculum requirements recent educational-reform movements. The committees believe this legislative change is consistent with current trends in the secondary-education reform movement. Further, there are sufficient legislative safeguards to ensure that prospective students enrolled in such courses will be academically prepared to succeed at a four-year collegiate institution.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 17 (NO. 2-22) SATISFACTORY PROGRESS — INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM EXAMINATIONS

Intent: To allow institutions to grant satisfactory-progress credit through the international baccalaureate examinations.

Bylaws: Amend 14.4.3.4.3, page 132, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.4.3.4.3 Advanced-Placement Tests/International Baccalaureate Program Examinations/Credit by Examination. Credit received through advanced-placement tests or by examination or International Baccalaureate Program examinations may be utilized by the student to meet the minimum satisfactory-progress requirement, provided the subject for which the examination is an alternative is offered by the institution as acceptable degree credit."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Academic Requirements Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Current legislation permits student-athletes to use credit received through advanced-placement testing or through credit-by-examination to meet the minimum satisfactory-progress requirements, provided the institution offers courses and awards degree credit in the subject area for which the examination is an alternative. With a growing number of Division II institutions beginning to use the examinations offered through the International Baccalaureate Program as a substitute for advanced-placement tests, the belief is that the International Baccalaureate Program is a legitimate testing program and that student-athletes should be permitted to use credit received through International Baccalaureate Program examinations to meet the minimum satisfactory-progress requirements in the same manner that students currently are permitted to use credit received through the advanced-placement testing program.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 18 (NO. 2-24) FINANCIAL AID — BOARD ALLOWANCE**

Intent: To permit an institution, at its discretion, to provide a student-athlete receiving financial aid that covers the cost of meals with a board allowance that consists of three meals per day, even if the institution's maximum permissible board allowance for all students represents a lesser cost figure.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.2, page 157, as follows:

[Division II]

"15.2.2 Room and Board. An institution may provide a student-athlete financial aid that includes the cost of room and board, based on the official allowance for room and board as listed in the institution's official publication (e.g., catalog) and a board allowance that consists of three meals per day, even if the institution's maximum permissible award allowance for all students represents a lesser cost figure.

"15.2.2.1 Off-Campus Room and Board Stipend. If a student-athlete lives and eats in noninstitutional facilities, the

institution may pay the student-athlete an amount equal to the institution's official on-campus room and board allowance as listed in its catalog, or the average of the room and board costs of all of its students living on campus. **The institution also may pay the student-athlete an amount that is equivalent to an on-campus 7-day or 21-meal board plan,** excluding those eating at the meals provided as part of training table. Meals provided on the training table shall be deducted at the regular-cost figure from such a student-athlete's board allowance.

[15.2.2.1.1 unchanged.]

"15.2.2.1.2 Determination of Off-Campus Board Costs. An institution with several on-campus board plans (e.g., 5-day, 7-day, 14-meal, 17-meal or 21-meal plans) may provide a student-athlete living in noninstitutional facilities with the equivalent of a full-board (e.g., 7-day or 21-meal) plan at that institution."

[Remainder of 15.2.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In many instances, an institution's maximum board allowance published in its catalog for all students is less than the equivalent of three meals per day. Further, many institutions contract their dining services to outside entities and these entities often establish meal plans that are fewer than a 7-day/21-meal plan. The outside entity will establish their meal plan based on a survey given to the general student body and assume that students will not be eating three meals per day in the institutional dining facilities. Student-athletes who attend these institutions may not be receiving the requisite meals necessary to meet the nutritional demands placed upon them as a result of participating in intercollegiate athletics. This proposal would address those needs as well as promote competitive equity by ensuring that an institution's meal plan is not used as a recruiting tool when offering a prospect financial aid that covers the cost of meals.

Action: Adopted, 167-34-4.

***NO. 19 (NO. 2-25) HOUSING AND MEALS — VACATION PERIOD EXPENSES**

Intent: To specify that an institution may provide room and board expenses for specific periods of time to student-athletes who return to the institution's campus during a vacation period following institutional competition.

Bylaws: Amend 16.5.1, page 180, as follows:

[Division II]

"16.5.1 Permissible. Identified housing and meal benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are:

[16.5.1-(a) through 16.5.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Vacation-Period Expenses. The institution may provide the cost of room and board to student-athletes (during the institution's official institutional vacation periods during the regular academic year) when in the following circumstances:

"(1) Student-athletes who are required to remain on the institution's campus for organized practice sessions or competition during the institution's official vacation period during the regular academic year. If the student-athlete lives at home during the vacation period, the cost of room and board may not be provided by the institution, other than to permit the student-athlete to participate in team meals incidental to practice sessions. If an institution does not provide a meal to its student-athletes, a cash allowance may be provided, not to exceed the amount provided by the institution to institutional staff members on away from campus trips.

"(2) Student-athletes who return to campus during the institution's official vacation period occurring during a regular academic term (e.g., not including vacation periods between terms) from competition as outlined in 16.8.1.2-(a) through 16.8.1.2-(e). Under such circumstances, room and board expenses may be provided beginning with the student-athlete's arrival on campus until the institution's regular dormitories and dining facilities reopen. If the student-athlete lives at home during the vacation period, the cost of room and board may not be provided by the institution.

"(3) Student-athletes who return to campus during the institution's official vacation period between regular academic terms (e.g., summer vacation period) from competition as outlined in 16.8.1.2-(a) through 16.8.1.2-(e). Under such circumstances, room and board expenses may be provided for no more than a 48-hour period, beginning with the student-athlete's return to campus. If the student-athlete lives at home during the vacation period, the cost of room and board may not be provided by the institution."

[16.5.1-(f) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: It is a common occurrence for an institution's team to return to campus from season-ending competition (e.g., last regular-season contest, conference tournament, postseason tournament) during an institutional vacation period. Under the current legislation, it is not permissible for the institution to provide any expenses to student-athletes once they arrive back on campus, even if dormitories and dining facilities are closed. Although the current legislation does allow institutions to provide travel expenses to student-athletes for a period of time up to 36 hours following the end of the competition, this does not include room and board expenses once student-athletes have returned to the institution's campus. This proposal would permit institutions the discretion of providing room and board for a reasonable period of time in these situations.

Action: Adopted, 194-2-1.

NO 20 (NO. 2-30) WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIPS —
SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA —
MINIMUM PERIOD

Intent: To specify that a new championship may be established in a women's sport if the minimum number of sponsoring institutions exist for one academic year (rather than for two consecutive academic years).

[Note: The proposed change involves a common provision, and thus, must be approved by Divisions I, II and III acting independently.]

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.4.2.1, page 280, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"18.2.4.2 Sponsorship Criteria

"18.2.4.2.1 Minimum Period. In men's sports, The applicable minimum sponsorship number must exist for two consecutive academic years in order for a championship to be established. Legislation to establish the championship may be proposed during the second year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. In women's sports, the applicable minimum sponsorship number must exist for one academic year in order for a championship to be established. Legislation to establish the championship may be proposed during the year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. Varsity sports sponsored prior to August 1, 1994, shall count toward the two consecutive minimum one or two-year sponsorship requirement."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Bylaws 18.2.4.1 and 18.2.4.2.1 currently specify that a championship may be established in a women's sport if at least 40 institutions sponsor the sport, and that such legislation may be established after the sport has met the minimum requirement for two consecutive years. Currently the number of institutions sponsoring emerging sports is as follows: women's water polo (37 institutions), women's ice hockey (40), women's squash (27) and women's bowling (21). If the waiting period were reduced from two years to one year, legislation could be proposed in 1999-00 to establish a women's ice hockey championship in 2000-01. It is anticipated that sponsorship of women's water polo will reach 40 by the end of the 1999-00 academic year; if that occurs, legislation also could be proposed in 1999-00 to establish a women's water polo championship in 2000-01. This proposal will assist member institutions in meeting their legal obligations under Title IX.

Action: Adopted, 187-14-4.

NO. 21 (NO. 2-31) NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIP — WOMEN'S ICE HOCKEY

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Championship in the sport of women's ice hockey, effective 2000-01, and to establish a women's ice hockey committee.

[Note: The proposed changes involve common provisions, and thus, must be approved by Divisions I, II and III acting independently.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.3.1, page 281, as follows:
[Division II]

"18.3.1 National Collegiate Championships (9 10)

"Men (3)	Men and Women (3)	Women (3 4)
Gymnastics	Fencing	Gymnastics
Volleyball	Rifle	Ice Hockey
Water Polo	Skiing	Lacrosse (Divisions I and II only)
		Rowing"

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.2, page 316, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3 COMMON COMMITTEES—COMMITTEES WITH PLAYING RULES AND CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

"21.3.2 Ice Hockey Committee, Women's. The Women's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of seven members, including the secretary-rules editor."

[21.3.2 through 21.3.8 renumbered as 21.3.3 through 21.3.9, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In an effort to increase NCAA championship opportunities for women, selected NCAA sports such as ice hockey have been identified as sports in which to establish a National Collegiate Championship. Currently there are 40 member institutions that sponsor women's ice hockey. The establishment of a championship for women's ice hockey necessitates the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administration responsibilities.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 22 (NO. 2-32) NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIP — WOMEN'S WATER POLO

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Championship in the sport of women's water polo, effective 2000-01, and to establish a women's water polo committee.

[Note: The proposed changes involve common provisions, and thus, must be approved by Divisions I, II and III acting independently.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.3.1, page 281, as follows:
[Division II]

"18.3.1 National Collegiate Championships (9 10)

"Men (3)	Men and Women (3)	Women (3 4)
Gymnastics	Fencing	Gymnastics
Volleyball	Rifle	Lacrosse (Divisions I and II only)
Water Polo	Skiing	Rowing
		Water Polo"

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.3, by adding new 21.3.8, page 317, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3 COMMON COMMITTEES—COMMITTEES WITH PLAYING RULES AND CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

"21.3.8 Water Polo Committee, Women's. The Women's Water Polo Committee shall consist of six members, including the secretary-rules editor."

[21.3.8 renumbered as 21.3.9, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In an effort to increase NCAA championship opportunities for women, selected NCAA sports, such as water polo, have been identified as sports in which to establish a National Collegiate Championship. Currently there are 37 member institutions that

sponsor women's water polo. The establishment of a championship for women's water polo necessitates the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administration responsibilities.

Action: Adopted.

***NO. 23 (NO. 2-34) GEOGRAPHICAL SCHEDULING
WAIVER—FOOTBALL**

Intent: To eliminate the geographic scheduling waiver that is based on athletically related aid awarded by the institution in the sport of football.

Bylaws: Amend 20.10.4.3.4, page 307, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"20.10.4.3.4 Geographical Waiver—Division II Football. The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the provisions of 20.10.4.1 for a Division II institution that does not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football, or which offers fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II football, if it is determined that fewer than six other Division II football programs exist within a 500-mile radius of the institution's campus that do not offer athletically related financial aid in the sport of football or offer fewer than 20 percent of the maximum allowable number of scholarships in Division II football. An institution shall calculate the applicable percentage based upon the amount of athletically related financial aid received by its student-athletes in the sport of football as opposed to including all institutional aid in that sport."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The geographical waiver of the 50-percent scheduling requirement in the sport of football should be eliminated inasmuch as such a waiver in Division II should not be contingent upon the amount of athletically related financial aid an institution awards in football or the number of institutions granting minimal aid that are located in close proximity to the institution. This legislation was written specifically to assist Division I-AA institutions and does not have a practical application in Division II. An institution that has legitimate geographical difficulty in scheduling opponents may apply for a waiver per Bylaw 20.10.4.4.

Action: Adopted, 115-3-2 (football-playing institutions only).

***NO. 24 (Dereg. 1) USE OF INSTITUTIONAL NAME OR
LOGO**

Intent: To eliminate the prohibition on athletics department's staff

A-24

Legislative Proposals

members using the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval by the institution's chief executive officer.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1, pages 53-54, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.1 CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL

[11.1.1 through 11.1.3 unchanged.]

"11.1.4 Use of Institutional Name or Logo. Athletics department staff members shall not, directly or by implication, use the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer in Divisions I and II and without prior approval from the institution in Division III."

[11.1.5 through 11.1.7 renumbered as 11.1.4 through 11.1.6, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2, pages 55-56, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.2 Income in Addition to Institutional Salary

[11.3.2.1 through 11.3.2.4 unchanged.]

"11.3.2.5 Endorsement of Commercial Products. Athletics department staff members shall not use, directly or by implication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer in Divisions I and II and without prior approval from the institution in Division III (see 11.2.2)."

[11.3.2.6 through 11.3.2.10 renumbered as 11.3.2.5 through 11.3.2.9, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation, the Division II Legislation Committee believes that it is not necessary to legislate the prohibition of athletics department's staff members utilizing, directly or by implication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer. The committee believes that the institution and copyright laws governing the use of institutional names and logos adequately control this issue.

Action: Adopted, 183-8-2.

Legislative Proposals

A-25

***NO. 25 (Dereg. 2) PERSONNEL - ATHLETICALLY
RELATED INCOME**

Intent: To eliminate the requirement than an institution must include, in contracts and letters of appointment, a stipulation that requires staff members to receive prior approval for the chief executive officer for all athletically related income.

Bylaws: Amend 11.2.2, page 54, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.2.2 Athletically Related Income. Contractual agreements, including letters of appointment, between a full-time or part-time athletics department staff member (excluding secretarial or clerical personnel) and an institution shall include the stipulation that the staff member is required to receive annually prior written approval from the chief executive officer for all athletically related income and benefits from sources outside the institution. The staff member's request for approval also shall be in writing and shall include the amount and the source of the income. Sources of such income shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- "(a) Income from annuities;*
- "(b) Sports camps;*
- "(c) Housing benefits (including preferential housing arrangements);*
- "(d) Country club memberships;*
- "(e) Complimentary ticket sales;*
- "(f) Television and radio programs; and*
- "(g) Endorsement or consultation contracts with athletics shoe, apparel or equipment manufacturers.*

"11.2.2.1 Prior Approval for Institutionally Determined Limited Amount of Income. It is permissible for an institution's chief executive officer to grant general prior written approval for a staff member to receive income that does not exceed an institutionally determined nominal amount (not to exceed \$500 per event) for participation in any athletically related activity. A detailed accounting of all such income shall be provided annually in writing by the staff member to the chief executive officer."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation, the Division II Legislation Committee believes that this legislation can be eliminated from the Division II Manual. In rare occurrences when this legislation does impact Division II institutions, issues relating to athletically related income are more appropriately controlled at the institutional level. Further, in Division II, outside income in significant

amounts is not commonplace. Issues relating to outside income should be left to the discretion of the institution.

Action: Adopted, 191-4-1.

***NO. 26 (Dereg. 3) OUTSIDE INCOME RESTRICTIONS**

Intent: To eliminate the outside-income restrictions for Division II coaches.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.1, page 54, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.2.1 Bona Fide Outside Employment. A staff member may earn income in addition to the institutional salary by performing services for outside groups, provided the compensation is for additional work actually performed and at a rate commensurate with the going rate in that locality for services of like character; further, such outside work must be in conformity with institutional policy and with the approval of the institution. In Divisions I and II, athletically related income requires the prior written approval of the institution's chief executive officer (see 11.2.2)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.2, page 55, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.2.2 Supplemental Pay. An outside source is prohibited from paying or regularly supplementing an athletics department staff member's annual salary and from arranging to supplement that salary for an unspecified achievement. This includes the donation of cash from outside sources to the institution earmarked for the staff member's salary or supplemental income. It would be permissible for an outside source to donate funds to the institution to be used as determined by the institution, and it would be permissible for the institution, at its sole discretion, to use such funds to pay or supplement a staff member's salary."

C. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.3, page 55, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.2.3 Bonuses for Specific and Extraordinary Achievement. An institution may permit an outside individual, group or agency to supplement an athletics department staff member's salary with a direct cash payment in recognition of a specific and extraordinary achievement (e.g., contribution during career to the athletics department of the institution, winning a conference or national championship, number of games or meets won during career/season), provided such a cash supplement is in recognition of a specific achievement and is in conformance with institutional policy."

D. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.4, page 55, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.2.4 Extra Compensation Restriction for Division II and Divi-

sion III Coaches. A member institution shall not give extra compensation or remuneration of any sort to any coach conditioned upon or because of the number of games the coach's team wins, or because the team goes to a bowl game or tournament or participates in championships. These limitations on extra compensation to coaches do not apply where enforceable contracts or formal security-of-employment commitments in effect on August 15, 1976, make it impossible to comply with the limitations. These exceptions are continued until existing contracts or formal security-of-employment commitments expire."

E. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.5, page 55, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.2.5 Endorsement of Commercial Products. Athletics department staff members shall not use, directly or by implication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer in Divisions I and II and without prior approval from the institution in Division III (see 11.2.2)."

[11.3.2.6 through 11.3.2.8 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.9, pages 55-56, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.2.9 Compensation for Scheduling Contests/Individual Participation. Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities for scheduling athletics contests or individual meet participation with another institution or a sponsor of athletics competition. This specifically precludes the acceptance of compensation or gratuities from other institutions, schedule brokers or agents, and television networks or syndicators. Staff members shall not accept compensation for personal appearances (e.g., speaking engagements, clinicians) held in conjunction with the competition in which the institution's team is a participant. A coach may receive a participatory gift from the sponsor of an event similar to the gift awarded to student-athletes participating in the event provided the gift meets the applicable awards limitation set forth in 16.1.4."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The Division II Legislation Committee believes that this legislation is not relevant to Division II in most cases and can be eliminated from the Division II Manual. In rare occurrences when these bylaws do impact Division II institutions, the issues are more appropriately controlled at the institutional level. In Division II, outside income in significant amounts is not commonplace; further, it should not be legislated that institutions monitor receipt of outside income. The committee

believes that this should also be at the discretion of the institution.

Action: Adopted, 203-3-1 (No. 26E moot due to adoption of Proposal No. 24-B).

***NO. 27 (Dereg. 4) EMPLOYMENT WITH PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATIONS — NONPERMISSIBLE ARRANGEMENTS**

Intent: To permit institutional staff members to be employed by professional sports organizations during times in which they are not under contract with the institution.

A. Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 11.3.3.1, page 56, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.3 Employment with Professional Sports Organizations

"11.3.3.1 Nonpermissible Employment Arrangements. Staff members of a member institution's athletics department shall not accept compensation or gratuities for representing a professional sports organization as a coach or scout, in the negotiating of a contract, or for the performance of other services that involve the observation of or contact with athletics talent **except during times in which the staff member is not under contract with the institution.** Except as provided in 11.3.3.2, any compensational arrangement between a professional sports organization and a college staff member (e.g., for scouting other professional teams or assisting the professional employer in coaching its team) is evidence of an indirect arrangement to assure the staff member's assistance in evaluating or procuring college talent."

B. Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 11.3.3.1.1, page 56, as follows:

[Division II]

"11.3.3.1 Nonpermissible Employment Arrangements

"11.3.3.1.1 Employment During Periods When Not under Contract with Member Institution. A staff member may not be compensated by a professional sports organization for services rendered during a period in which the staff member is not actually under contract to the institution or is absent from campus (e.g., temporary leave of absence, paid or unpaid). This provision applies to individuals employed by the member institution on a regular and continuing basis, even though the contract may be for a period of less than a full year."

[11.3.3.1.2 renumbered as 11.3.3.1.1.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislative Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal is a result of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. The Legislation Committee feels employment with professional sports organizations during times a staff member is not under contract with an institution should be permissible in Division II. Division II coaching salaries are, in most cases, not comparable to those in Division I and very often necessitate coaches securing outside employment during the summer when they normally are not under contract with the institution (i.e., Division II coaching contracts are not normally 12-month contracts). Many times, such employment is available through professional sports organizations. An amendment to this legislation would be deregulation not only because legislation would be deleted but it also would no longer make it necessary for an institution to monitor such outside employment during times when staff members are not under contract with the institution.

Action: Adopted, 195-7-2.

***NO. 28 (Dereg. 5) PERMISSIBLE EMPLOYMENT OR INCOME ARRANGEMENTS—PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ORGANIZATION**

Intent: To eliminate legislation stating it is permissible for employees of the institution, who are not associated with the athletics department, to be employed by professional sports organizations.

Bylaws: Amend Bylaw 11.3.3.2, page 56, as follows:
[Division II]

"11.3.3.2 Permissible Employment or Income Arrangements

"11.3.3.2.2 *Employees Not Associated with Athletics Department. A staff member of a separate physical education school or department of an institution who has no relationship with or duties within the athletics department is not prohibited from working for a professional sports organization.*"

[11.3.3.2.3 and 11.3.3.2.4 renumbered as 11.3.3.2.2 and 11.3.3.2.3, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal is a result of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. The Legislation Committee feels that this is repetitive legislation and should be removed from the Manual. The committee believes that the language of NCAA Bylaw 11.3.3.1 clearly states that restrictions relating to employment with professional sports organizations applies only to athletics department staff members. In that regard, it should not be necessary to reiterate that staff members in physical education departments who have no relationship to and/or responsibilities in

the athletics department are not prohibited from securing employment with a professional sports organization.

Action: Adopted, 191-1-2.

***NO. 29 (Dereg. 6) RECRUITING—TELEPHONE CALLS BY REPRESENTATIVES OF ATHLETICS INTERESTS**

Intent: To prohibit "representatives of athletics interest" from making telephone calls to prospective student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.01.5.2, page 75, as follows:
[Division II]

"13.01.5.2 Division II. In Division II, representatives of an institution's athletics interests (as defined in 13.02.12) are prohibited from making in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts or phone calls with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians. On-campus contact is permitted, as are written and telephonic communications. Recruiting contacts by representatives during a prospect's official visit are confined to campus and may not extend to the 30-mile radius permitted institutional staff members (see also 13.1.3.4.2)."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.5, page 81, as follows:
[Division II]

"13.1.2.5 Other Restrictions, Athletics Representatives. The following are additional restrictions that apply to athletics representatives.

"(b) *Telephone Calls. In Division II, it is permissible for an athletics representative (as defined in 13.02.12) to make telephone calls to a prospect on or after July 1 (August 15 in football) following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school. Any such telephone call must count as the institution's one telephone contact per week.*"

[13.1.2.5-(c) through 13.1.2.5-(e) relettered as 13.1.2.5-(b) through 13.1.2.5-(d), unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.4.2, page 82, as follows:
[Division II]

"13.1.3.4.2 Representatives of Athletics Interests—Division II. In Division II, it is **not** permissible for an athletics representative (as defined in 13.02.12) to make telephone calls to a prospect on or after July 1 following the prospect's completion of the junior year in high school; further, any such telephone calls must count as the institution's one telephone contact per week."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal is a result of the NCAA Division II deregulation project.

lation project. Current legislation permits representatives of athletics interests to place phone calls to prospective student-athletes. The Legislation Committee recommends that the legislation be amended to preclude phone calls to prospects by representatives of athletics interests. The committee feels this is an important element of Division II deregulation efforts inasmuch as it would eliminate the need for extensive monitoring of phone calls placed by boosters. In addition, this will help to alleviate concerns of improper contact and inaccurate information being provided to prospects by nonathletics staff members.

Action: Adopted, 188-14-0.

***NO. 30 (Dereg. 7) RECRUITING — CONTACT AND TELEPHONE CALLS**

Intent: To set June 15 immediately preceding the prospect's senior year in high school as the first permissible date for contacts and telephone calls in all Division II sports.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.01.6, pages 75-76, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.01.6 Time Periods for Telephone Calls and Contacts. In Divisions I and II, telephone calls or in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardians prior to **July 1 June 15** (September 1 in Division II football and September 1 in Divisions I-A and I-AA football) following the prospect's completion of immediately preceding the prospect's junior senior year in high school. In Division III, in-person, off-campus contacts with a prospect or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) may not be made until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. In Divisions I and II football and basketball, such contacts are confined to specific contact periods. In all Divisions I and II sports, time periods are established during which no on- or off-campus contacts are permitted (see 30.11 and Figures 13-3 through 13-7).

"13.01.6.2 Exception—Division II Football. In Division II football, one telephone call to a prospect [or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may be made during the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school.

"13.01.6.4 Exception—Division II Basketball. In the sports of men's and women's basketball, one telephone call to a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] may be made on or after June 21 of the prospect's junior year in high school. In addition, only three telephone calls to a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] may be made during the month of July following the prospect's junior year in high school, with no more than one telephone call per week."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.1.1, pages 79-81, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.1.1.1 High-School Prospects. In Divisions I and II, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) prior to **July 1 following June 15 immediately preceding** the prospect's completion of the junior senior year in high school. Telephone calls shall not be made with a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] prior to **July 1** (September 1 in Division II football and September 1 in Divisions I-A and I-AA football) following **June 15 immediately preceding** the prospect's completion of the junior senior year in high school. In Division III, in-person, off-campus recruiting contacts shall not be made with a prospect or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) until the prospect has completed the junior year in high school. U.S. service academy exceptions to this provision are set forth in 13.17.1.

"13.1.1.1.2 Exception—Division II Football. In Division II football, one telephone call may be made during the month of May of the prospect's junior year in high school.

"13.1.1.1.4 Exception—Division II Basketball. In the sports of men's and women's basketball, one telephone call to a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] may be made on or after June 21 of the prospect's junior year in high school. In addition, only three telephone calls to a prospect [or the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s)] may be made during the month of July following the prospect's junior year in high school, with no more than one telephone call per week."

[13.1.1.3 through 13.1.2.9.2 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.1, pages 81-82, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.1.3.1 Time Period for Telephone Calls—General Rule. In sports other than Divisions I and II football and Division I basketball, In Division II, telephone calls to a prospect [or the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may not be made prior to **July 1 following the completion of June 15 immediately preceding** the prospect's junior senior year in high school; thereafter, staff members shall not make such telephone calls more than once per week. In Division II football, telephone contact may be made at the institution's discretion during a contact period. If more than one call per week occurs due to a scheduled official paid visit that subsequently is canceled by the prospect, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1; however, it shall not affect the prospect's eligibility.

"13.1.3.1.1 Exception—Division II Football. In the sport of Division II football, telephone calls to a prospect [or a prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s)] may not be made prior to August 15 following the completion of junior year in

high school; thereafter, such telephone contact is limited to once per week outside of a contact period. During a contact period, such telephone contact may be made at the institution's discretion.

"13.1.3.1.3 Exception—Division II Basketball. In the sports of men's and women's basketball, one telephone call to a prospect for the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s) may be made on or after June 21 of the prospect's junior year in high school. In addition, only three telephone calls to a prospect for the prospect's parents or legal guardian(s) may be made during the month of July following the prospect's junior year in high school, with no more than one telephone call per week; thereafter, staff members shall not make such telephone calls more than once per week."

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.2.2, page 82, as follows:
[Division II]

"13.1.3.2.2 Telephone Calls Initiated by Prospect at Prospect's Expense. Institutional staff members may receive telephone calls placed by a prospect at the prospect's own expense at any time, including prior to July 1 (September 1 in football) following June 15 immediately preceding the prospect's junior senior year in high school."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal is a result of the Division II deregulation project. The committee recommends that this legislation should be amended so that the first permissible date for contacts and telephone calls in all sports be June 15 immediately preceding the prospect's senior year in high school. Inasmuch as part of the deregulation charge is to simplify application of legislation and reduce the size of the Division II Manual, the committee feels a common date for contacting prospects should exist for all sports. This would simplify the application of recruiting legislation in Division II and would simplify the administrative responsibility for documenting recruiting activities. This should alleviate the need for future proposals to continually amend the dates on a sport-by-sport basis.

Action: Adopted, 198-4-1.

NO. 31 (Dereg. 8) RECRUITING EVALUATIONS

Intent: To eliminate the restriction on the number of evaluations an institution is allowed to have per prospect per academic year.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.9, pages 84-86, as follows:
[Division II]

"13.1.9 Limitations on Number of Evaluations—All Sports—Division II. In Division II, there are no limitations on the

number of evaluations an institution is allowed per prospect per academic year. In sports other than Division I football, basketball and ice hockey, institutional staff members shall not evaluate a prospect on more than four occasions during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team (e.g., high-school team, all-star team, club team). In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, institutional staff members shall be limited to two evaluations during the academic year during which the prospect competes or practices on any team. Not more than one evaluation may be used during the fall evaluation period and not more than one evaluation may be used during the May evaluation period per Bylaw 30.11.5. In Division I basketball, each institution shall be limited to five recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more than three of the five opportunities may be contacts. In Division I ice hockey, each institution shall be limited to seven recruiting opportunities (contacts and evaluations combined) per prospect and not more than three of the seven opportunities may be contacts.

"13.1.9.1 Visit (Without Contact) to Prospect's Educational Institution. A visit (without contact) by a coaching staff member to a prospect's educational institution counts as an evaluation for all prospects in that sport at that educational institution.

"13.1.9.1.1 Competition Not Involving Educational Institution Visited. A member institution does not utilize an evaluation for prospects at an educational institution if the coach observes competition at that institution between prospects who do not attend that institution.

"13.1.9.2 Evaluations Are Sports Specific. The limitation in 13.1.9 is sports specific; therefore, a prospect being earnestly recruited [see 15.5.7.8.1-(d)] by an institution in more than one sport may be evaluated on the permissible number of occasions in each of those sports during the academic year. Evaluations are counted against the sport of the coach making the evaluation.

"13.1.9.2.1 Evaluations in Cross Country and Track and Field. An institution is limited to evaluating a prospect who competes in any or all of the sports of cross country and indoor and outdoor track and field on not more than four occasions (combined) during the prospect's academic year.

"13.1.9.3 On Same Day. Any number of evaluations or observations made during the same calendar day (defined as 12:01 a.m. to midnight) shall count as one evaluation.

"13.1.9.5 Football Evaluation Exceptions

"13.1.9.5.2 Limitations on the Number of May Evaluations. In the sport of football, institutional staff members shall not visit a prospect's educational institution on

more than one calendar day during the May evaluation period.

"13.1.9.6 Evaluations in Team Sports. In team sports, an institution shall utilize an evaluation for each prospect participating in a contest observed by the institution's coach.

"13.1.9.8 Evaluations in Individual Sports

"13.1.9.8.2 Division II. In Division II, in individual sports, an institution shall utilize an evaluation for each prospect participating at any time on a given day in a competition. Thus, an institution's coach who is attending a competition in an individual sport (e.g., track meet, swimming meet, tennis match) on a specific day shall utilize an evaluation for all participants in the competition on that day.

"13.1.9.9 Observations. Observing a contest or practice during the academic year shall count as one of the permissible number of evaluations (set forth in 13.1.9) for each prospect in the contest or practice, even if a contact is made during the same day. In Division I football, such observation that occurs during a permissible contact period shall count only as a contact per 13.02.3.1.

"13.1.9.9.1 Tournament Observations. In all sports, the evaluation of each contest in a tournament held during the academic year shall count as a separate evaluation except as follows:

"(a) Evaluation of multiple contests in a tournament that occurs on consecutive days (and normally at the same site) shall count as a single evaluation.

"(b) Evaluation of multiple contests in a single tier of a tournament (e.g., sectional, district, regional) shall count as a single observation. If a particular tier of a tournament is subdivided into identifiable segments (e.g., conducted on different weekends), evaluation of contests in each identifiable segment counts as a single observation.

"13.1.9.9.1.1 Exception—Division II Basketball. In Division II basketball, evaluation of contests in the state high-school basketball tournament that occurs within the state in which the member institution is located shall not count as an evaluation for any of the participating prospects.

"13.1.9.9.2 Women's Basketball—Olympic Festival Tryouts. Evaluation on more than one day at official tryouts for the USA Basketball Olympic Festival conducted during a permissible evaluation period (see 30.11.4) shall count as a single evaluation for women's basketball.

"13.1.9.10 Evaluations/Contact at Prospect's Educational Institution. In sports other than Division I football, if a coach makes an in-person recruiting contact at a prospect's

educational institution, all evaluations (other than observations of practice or competition) made on that calendar day at the prospect's educational institution shall not count among the permissible number of evaluations (set forth in 13.1.9) for any prospect at that institution in the applicable sport. In Division I football, any evaluation activity that occurs during a permissible contact period shall count only as a contact per 13.02.3.1 and 13.02.6.1.1.

"13.1.9.11 Open Events in Which College Teams Compete. An institution does not utilize an evaluation if the institution's team competes in an open meet (e.g., track meet) in which prospects also compete.

"13.1.9.12 Evaluations Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment. Subsequent to the calendar day on which a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent, there shall be no limit on the number of evaluations by the institution with which the prospect has signed. For an institution that does not utilize the National Letter of Intent, there shall be no limit on the number of evaluations with the prospect subsequent to the calendar day of the prospect's signed acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid.

"13.1.9.13 Effect of Violation. Violations of 13.1.9 shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal is a result of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. Current Division II legislation states that institutional staff members may evaluate the academic and/or athletics ability of a prospect at a site off the institution's campus a maximum of four times per academic year. The committee recommends the elimination of this legislation. The committee feels that a restriction on the number of evaluations is not a practical concept in Division II. Once an institution observes a contest involving a given team four times during the academic year, the institution is precluded from observing any future contests involving that team during that year. In reality, future evaluations involving this team may very well be for the purpose of evaluating the team's opponents. Current legislation prohibits this possibility often placing undue financial and travel hardships on institutional staff members. This change would allow institutions the latitude to evaluate a team (i.e., two-year college or high school) located in close proximity to the institution more than four times most likely for the purpose of evaluating prospects on the opposing team. This would not cause undue pressure on prospective student-athletes inasmuch as contact restrictions would still apply. In addition, the definition

of an evaluation and the existence of evaluation periods would remain in place.

Action: Adopted, 136-70-2.

NO. 32 (Dereg. 9) RECRUITING MATERIALS

Intent: To eliminate the list of permissible recruiting materials that a Division II institution may provide to a prospect.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.1, page 88-89, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.4.1 Divisions I and II—Printed Recruiting Materials. A Division I or Division II institution may not provide recruiting materials to a prospect (including general correspondence related to athletics) until September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school. Member institutions are permitted to provide only the printed materials listed below to prospects, coaches of prospects or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved. A member institution is not permitted to provide prospects with any recruiting materials not listed below (e.g., films, videotapes, original newspaper clippings in Division I). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.

"(a) Correspondence. General correspondence, including letters and postcards issued by the U.S. postal service (i.e., blank cards) and institutional note cards may be sent to a prospect only by mail. In Division I, attachments to general correspondence may include materials printed on plain white paper with black ink. In Divisions I-A and I-AA football, the content of all general recruiting correspondence to prospects (or prospects' parents or legal guardians) must be prepared by the head coach or one of the full-time assistant coaches. In addition, restricted-earnings coaches, which in the sport of football are permissible only in Division I-AA and at the national service academies in Division I-A, may prepare such correspondence.

"(b) Business Cards. Business cards may be provided to a prospect. (Adopted: 1/14/97)

"(c) Camp Brochures. Camp brochures may be provided to a prospect. Information contained in camp brochures must relate specifically to camp events and activities (as opposed to information that may not be provided to prospects). [Note: These brochures may be provided to a prospect prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school.] (Revised: 1/14/97)

"(d) Electronic Transmissions—Divisions I and II. Facsimiles and electronic mail may be sent to a prospect.

"(e) NCAA Educational Information. An institution may provide educational information published by the NCAA (e.g., NCAA Guide for the College-Bound Student-Athlete). [Note: This information may be provided to a prospect prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school.]

"(f) Newspaper Clippings—Division II Only. Newspaper clippings may be sent to a prospect, but may not be assembled in any form of scrapbook.

"(g) Preenrollment Information. Any necessary preenrollment information regarding orientation, conditioning, academics and practice activities may be sent to a prospect, provided the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or has been officially accepted for enrollment by the member institution. (Revised: 1/9/96)

"(h) Programs. Game programs (which may not include posters) may be provided to prospects only during official and unofficial recruiting visits and may not be mailed.

"(i) Publications (Athletics). An institution may produce either a recruiting brochure or media guide (but not both) in each sport it sponsors and provide it to a prospect. The publication may have only one color of printing inside the covers.

"(j) Publications (Nonathletics) Available to All Students. Official academic, admissions and student-services publications published by the institution and available to all students may be provided to prospects.

"(k) Questionnaires. Questionnaires may be provided to a prospect. [Note: These questionnaires may be provided to a prospect prior to September 1 at the beginning of the prospect's junior year in high school.]

"(l) Schedule Cards. One wallet-size playing schedule card per sport.

"(m) Student-Athlete Handbook. One student-athlete handbook, describing the institution's athletics department policies governing the conduct of student-athletes, may be provided to a prospect during official and unofficial recruiting visits or may be mailed once the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or has been accepted for enrollment by the member institution. The handbook may contain only one color of printing throughout the publication, including the cover."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This is a result of the Division II deregulation project. The committee recommends deletion of the list of permissible recruiting materials. The committee advocates retaining the initial date for providing these materials. The committee feels that Division II institutional athletic budgets provide an

Legislative Proposals—

A-39

inherent control over the amount and types of printed material that an institution develops for the purpose of recruiting. Exclusive of media guides, most times the athletic department utilizes printed material developed by the institution's recruiting/admissions office. The committee does not feel that this would be abused inasmuch as most institutional budgets would discourage institutional personnel from approving the production of "lucrative and excessive" printed materials.

Action: Adopted, 156-52-3.

***NO. 33 (Dereg. 10) RECRUITING — COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS (OFFICIAL VISITS)**

Intent: To allow institutions to provide complimentary admissions to prospects on official visits in the same manner such admissions are provided during unofficial visits.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.2, page 94, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5 Entertainment/Tickets on Official Visit

"13.7.5.2 Complimentary Admissions. During the official visit, a maximum of three complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event in which the institution's inter-collegiate team practices or competes may be provided only to a prospect. Such complimentary admissions are for the exclusive use of the prospect and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit and must be issued on an individual-game basis. and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse. Providing seating during the conduct of the event (including intermission) for the prospect or the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse in the facility's press box, special seating box(es) or bench area is specifically prohibited. For violations of this bylaw in which the individual receives an excessive number of complimentary admissions, and the value of the excessive admissions is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

[13.7.5.2.1 through 13.7.5.2.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal is a result of the NCAA Division II deregulation project. The Legislation Committee recommends an amendment to the current legislation so that complimentary admissions on official and unofficial visits are administered consistently. The committee feels that it is not necessary to distinguish between official and unofficial visits related to the provision of complimentary admissions. This proposal would make it permissible to provide three complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event for prospects on both official and unofficial visits. These complimentary admissions would be for the exclusive use of the prospect and those persons accompanying the prospect on the visit. Current legislation would continue to control provision of entertainment to high school and two-year college coaches.

Action: Adopted, 200-1-0.

***NO. 34 (Dereg. 11) RECRUITING — DIVISION II TRYOUT**

Intent: To permit an institution to provide one tryout per prospect per institution per sport.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.1, pages 100-101, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.12.2.1 Division II Tryouts. A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospect only on its campus or at a site at which it normally conducts practice or competition and only under the following conditions (see 17.02.12 for tryouts of currently enrolled students):

"(a) No more than one tryout per prospect per institution per sport shall be permitted;"

[13.12.2.1-(b) through 13.12.2.1-(g) unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This is a result of the Division II deregulation project. Under the current Division II tryout legislation only one tryout per prospect per institution is permitted. This proposal will permit an institution to provide one tryout per prospect per institution per sport. This proposal is consistent with the deregulation concept inasmuch as this modification would eliminate "book-keeping" necessary to "track" the tryout activities of multisport prospective student-athletes.

Action: Adopted, 202-2-2.

RECRUITING

NO. 35 (NO. 2-7) RECRUITING — TELEPHONE CALLS

Intent: To permit an institution to make unlimited telephone calls to prospective student-athletes subsequent to the calendar day on which the prospect has signed the institution's written offer of admission or financial aid, even if the institution subscribes to the National Letter of Intent program.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.3.3.3, page 82, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.1.3.3.3 Telephone Calls Subsequent to National Letter of Intent Signing or Other Written Commitment Offer of Admission or Financial Aid. Subsequent to the calendar day on which a prospect signs a National Letter of Intent or written offer of admission or financial aid, there shall be no limit on the number of telephone calls by the institution with which the prospect has signed. *For an institution not utilizing the National Letter of Intent in a particular sport, there shall be no limit on the number of telephone calls to a prospect, the prospect's relatives or legal guardian(s) by that institution subsequent to the calendar day in which the prospect signs acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid.*"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Many prospective student-athletes, both recruited and nonrecruited, have committed to an institution and intend to "walk-on" to an athletics team, but have not signed a National Letter of Intent. Under current recruiting rules, institutions are still subject to limits on the number of telephone calls that can be made to such prospects. This proposal would permit an institution to call committed prospects who have signed the institution's written offer of admission or financial aid on the same basis as they call those prospects who have signed a National Letter of Intent.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 36 (NO. 2-8) OFFERS AND INDUCEMENTS — EMPLOYMENT OF TWO-YEAR PROSPECTS

Intent: To specify that the arrangement of employment by an institution for a two-year college prospect shall be permitted only if the prospect has officially withdrawn from or has completed requirements for graduation at the two-year college.

Bylaws: Amend 13.2.4.1 by adding new 13.2.4.1.1, page 87, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.2.4.1.1 Two-Year College Prospects. Once a prospect has enrolled as a full-time student in a two-year college, the arrangement of employment by an institution for such a prospect shall be permitted, provided the employment does not begin prior to the time period in which the prospect has officially withdrawn from or has completed requirements for graduation at the two-year college."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Under current legislation, an institution is permitted to arrange employment for a prospect that begins subsequent to completion of the prospect's senior year in high school. Thus, institutions currently are permitted to arrange employment opportunities for prospects who attend two-year colleges, including nonqualifiers or partial qualifiers who failed to satisfy the minimum initial-eligibility requirements upon graduation from high school. The arrangement of employment opportunities for prospects currently enrolled at two-year colleges should be considered an improper offer and inducement, inasmuch as it creates unnecessary pressure for institutions to arrange for employment opportunities in an effort to persuade the prospect to attend the member institution. Consistent with the current regulation that relates to high-school prospects, once a prospect enrolls as a full-time student at a two-year college, the arrangement for employment should be permissible only if the employment does not start until such time as the prospect has withdrawn from or has completed requirements for graduation at the two-year college.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 37 (NO. 2-10) RECRUITING — VIDEO MATERIALS

Intent: To permit an institution to produce and show electronically stored information to a prospect and his or her coach, as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.2 by adding new 13.4.2.3, pages 89-90, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.4.2.3 Electronic Information. An institution may produce and show electronically stored information about the institution to a prospect or the prospect's coach but may not send it or leave it with the prospect or coach. Information may include still photos and printed text that is electronically stored and delivered, and relates direct-

ly to a particular institution and city. Further, the printed text shall cover only information pertaining to the institution's student services, academic admissions, catalog and campus life in addition to basic information pertaining to the immediate town/city where the institution is located."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Most institutions have Web sites today that are available to families who can afford a computer. This proposal would allow the same type of information contained on those Web sites (e.g., information about educational offerings, the local community) to be shared with prospects who cannot afford a computer or Internet access.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 38 (NO. 2-10) ADVERTISEMENTS AND PROMOTIONS — CHAMPIONSHIPS POSTERS

Intent: To permit an institution that hosts an NCAA or conference championship to produce a poster promoting the championship and send it to a high-school coach and/or his or her educational institution.

Bylaws: Amend 13.4.5 by adding new 13.4.5.3, pages 89-90, renumbering subsequent paragraphs unchanged, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.4.5.3 NCAA or Conference Championship Posters. An institution hosting an NCAA or conference championship may produce a poster promoting the championship and send it to a high-school coach and/or his or her educational institution. It is not permissible to send such a poster to a prospect."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Under current legislation, it is permissible for an institution hosting an NCAA or conference championship to produce a poster to promote the championship, provided it is not sent directly to prospects, their coaches and/or their educational institutions. Institutions hosting an NCAA or conference championship may provide information related to the event through general correspondence. Permitting an institution that is hosting an NCAA or conference championship to produce a poster promoting the championship and send it to high-school coaches and/or their educational institutions will allow for a more effective promotion of the event and, potentially increase attendance

Legislative Proposals

by the general public. However, in order to minimize the use of these posters as a recruiting tool, it remains impermissible for an institution to send such posters directly to prospective student-athletes.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 39 (NO. 2-13) OFFICIAL VISIT — COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS

Intent: To permit a prospect and a prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse to receive complimentary admission during an official visit to attend an institution's off-campus regular-season home contest, provided the site of the contest is located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus.

Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.2 by adding new 13.7.5.2.1, page 94, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.2.1 Off-Campus Home Competition. Complimentary admissions may be provided to a prospect and a prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse to attend an institution's off-campus home competition, provided the site of the competition is located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Legislation Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Complimentary admissions to home competitions outside the community currently are available to prospects and parents (or legal guardians or spouse) on unofficial visits. However, on official visits, complimentary admissions are only available to campus athletics events. Under current legislation, a prospect can purchase a ticket to an off-campus home contest using the entertainment allowance, provided the site of the competition is within the permissible 30-mile radius. This proposal would permit a prospect and his or her parents (or legal guardians or spouse) to attend a local off-campus regular-season home competition without having to use his or her entertainment allowance.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 40 (NO. 2-15) NONSCHOLASTIC-BASED BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit coaches in the sport of Division II basketball to participate in coaching activities involving nonscholastic-based teams, provided the participants have not entered the ninth grade.

Bylaws: Amend 13.12.1.4, page 100, as follows:

Legislative Proposals

[Division II]

"13.12.1.4 Nonscholastic-Based Basketball. In Divisions I and II, a member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving nonscholastic-based basketball teams, regardless of the age or gender of the participants involved in such teams. **In Division II, a member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving nonscholastic-based basketball teams, if any of the participants is of prospect age or older (i.e., ninth grade or above).** In addition, in Divisions I and II, coaching staff members may not participate on such teams that include individuals with eligibility remaining or that include individuals of prospect age or younger. In Division III, a member of an institution's coaching staff may not participate in coaching activities involving AAU basketball teams, regardless of the age or gender of the participants involved in such teams."

Source: All members of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association; all members of the Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference; Abilene Christian University; Angelo State University; Cameron University; University of Central Oklahoma; Eastern New Mexico University; Harding University; Midwestern State University; Northwestern State University; Ouachita Baptist University; Southeastern Oklahoma State University; Southwestern Oklahoma State University; Tarleton State University; Texas A&M University-Commerce; Texas A&M University-Kingsville; and West Texas A&M University.

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Legislation currently precludes a member of an institution's coaching staff from being involved in coaching activities of a nonscholastic-based basketball team, regardless of the age of the participants. In other sports, coaches (full-time, part-time, graduate or volunteer) can coach youth teams, up through high school per Bylaw 13.12.2.4 (Local Sports Clubs). Basketball should be treated in a similar fashion by permitting coaches to be involved in coaching activities with local youth teams, providing the participants have not entered the ninth grade.

Council/Committee Positions (Division II Presidents Council and Legislation Committee): The Council and committee support this proposal.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

ELIGIBILITY

NO. 41 (NO. 2-18) SEASON OF COMPETITION WAIVER — 60-DAY DEADLINE

Intent: To delete the 60-day deadline provision from the application requirements for a season of competition waiver.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.7.1.2, page 123, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.2.7.1.2 Application Deadline. The institution shall submit its request for a waiver not later than 60 days from the date on which the institution first has knowledge that the student-athlete competed while ineligible."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee believes that the current legislation punishes the student-athlete for administrative error on the part of the member institution. The elimination of a deadline allows the institution to submit such a waiver at anytime after the institution discovers the student-athlete competed while ineligible.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

NO. 42 (NO. 2-26) CONTEST EXEMPTION — DIVISION II FOOTBALL — MINERAL WATER BOWL

Intent: To permit teams from the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference to participate in the Mineral Water Bowl and to exempt such participation from the limitations governing the permissible number of contests.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.4, pages 224-225, as follows:

[Division II football only]

[17.10.4.1 and 17.10.4.2 unchanged.]

"17.10.4.3 Mineral Water Bowl Restrictions. All members of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference shall participate in the Division II Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation. In addition, members of those conferences that participate in the Division II Football Championship shall not participate in the Mineral Water Bowl during the same year."

[17.10.4.3 renumbered as 17.10.4.4, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.10.5.2, pages 226-227, as follows:

[Division II football only]

"17.10.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of football contests shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-13):

[17.10.5.2-(a) through 17.10.5.2-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) Mineral Water Bowl. Participation in the Mineral Water Bowl held between representatives of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference."

[17.10.5.2-(e) through 17.10.5.2-(r) relettered as 17.10.5.2-(f) through 17.10.5.2-(s), unchanged.]

Source: All members of the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and all members of the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposed legislation would afford a representative from the Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association and a representative from the Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference to participate in a postseason bowl game. All members of both conferences would continue to participate in the NCAA Division II Football Championship, if eligible and selected for participation. This game would involve only teams not selected for the Division II football playoffs. This legislation is modeled after the Pioneer Bowl, which matches teams from the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

Committee Position (Division II Championships Committee):
The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 43 (NO. 2-27) MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION
— DIVISION II WOMEN'S LACROSSE —**

Intent: To permit a Division II institution in the sport of women's lacrosse to engage in 17 dates of competition during the championship segment and five dates of competition during another segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.1, page 236, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.14.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. In all divisions, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of lacrosse during the institution's lacrosse playing season to 17 dates of competition in men's lacrosse and Divisions II and III women's lacrosse, and 17 dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition during another segment in Divisions I and II women's lacrosse, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.14.5.2 and 17.14.5.6."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.1.2, pages 236-237, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.14.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in

not more than 17 dates of competition in men's lacrosse and Divisions II and III women's lacrosse, and 17 dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition during another segment in Divisions I and II women's lacrosse. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

Source: All members of the Northeast-10 Conference and all members of the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal would allow NCAA Division II institutions to provide the same participation opportunities during the non-championship segment in women's lacrosse that currently apply for Division II field hockey, men's and women's soccer, women's volleyball and Division I women's lacrosse. Division II has a guaranteed berth in the National Collegiate Women's Lacrosse Championship. This proposal would enhance the opportunity for participation in and preparation for Division II lacrosse programs competing for a position in a National Collegiate Women's Lacrosse Championship against primarily Division I programs.

Council/Committee Positions (Division II Presidents Council and Championships Committee): The Council supports this proposal. The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 44 (NO. 2-28) PRESEASON PRACTICE START DATE
— DIVISION II TENNIS —**

Intent: To specify that an institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship in tennis during the fall may commence practice August 24 or the institution's first day of classes, whichever is earlier.

Bylaws: Amend 17.24.2 by adding new 17.24.2.1, page 262, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.24.2.1 Exception—Division II. An institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship during the fall may commence practice August 24 or the institution's first day of classes, whichever is earlier."

Source: All members of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and all members of the Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: When legislation was adopted January 14, 1997, to set September 7 or the institution's first day of class as the date

when preseason practice in the sport of tennis can commence, there was no consideration for those conferences that conduct their only conference championship in the fall. This exception would not penalize those institutions that begin classes on or after September 7.

Committee Position (Division II Championships Committee):
The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 45 (NO. 2-29) FIRST DATE OF COMPETITION —
DIVISION II TENNIS**

Intent: To specify that an institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship in tennis during the fall may conduct its first contest or practice match with outside competition September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday.

Bylaws: Amend 17.24.3 by adding new 17.24.3.1, page 262, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.24.3.1 Exception—Division II. An institution that is a member of a conference that conducts its only conference championship during the fall may conduct its first contest or practice match with outside competition September 1 or the preceding Friday if September 1 falls on a Saturday or Sunday."

Source: All members of the Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and all members of the Northeast-10 Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In some areas of the country, it is more advantageous to conduct conference championships in tennis during the fall. An earlier start to the season would allow the schedule to be completed before inclement weather occurs. Most Division II institutions do not have the luxury of indoor tennis facilities.

Committee Position (Division II Championships Committee):
The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

GENERAL

**NO. 46 (NO. 2-2) DIVISION II MEMBERSHIP —
TRANSFER OF PROVISIONAL
MEMBERSHIP**

Intent: To permit the Division II Management Council, upon recommendation from the Division II Membership Committee, to

waive one year of the four-year provisional membership period, if an institution transfers its provisional membership from Division III or Division I to Division II.

Constitution: Amend 3.6.1.2 by adding new 3.6.1.2.2, page 17, as follows:

[Division II]

"3.6.1.2.2 Transfer of Provisional Membership from Division I or III to Division II. The Division II Management Council may waive one year of the four-year provisional membership period if an institution transfers its provisional membership from Division I or III to Division II. The institution shall serve a minimum of four total years of provisional membership before being considered for active membership."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: During the first two years of provisional membership, institutions are educated regarding the requirements for active membership in the division that the institution has selected. During the educational segment of provisional membership, some institutions that initially sought Division I or III membership discover that they are better suited for Division II membership. When such circumstances occur, the provisional member transferring from Division I or III into Division II should be afforded the opportunity to do so without being required to begin the four-year provisional membership process again.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 47 (NO. 2-33) CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP —
NOTIFICATION AND CHAMPIONSHIPS
ELIGIBILITY**

Intent: To establish a three-year notification period for institutions that intend to reclassify from Division II to Division III; further, to exclude those institutions that have forwarded such notice to the national office from eligibility for any Division II championship and from service on Division II committees.

A. Bylaws: Amend 20.5.2.1, page 302, as follows:

[Division II]

"20.5.2.1 Reclassification from Division II to Division I or III—Notification Requirement. The chief executive officer of a Division II member that intends to petition for reclassification to Division I or III per 20.5.2.2 shall submit to the Association's president written notice of the institution's intention to reclassify. The notice shall be received in the national office (by mail or wired transmission) not later than June 1 two years prior to the

September 1 when the institution intends to reclassify to Division I and not later than June 1 three years prior to the September 1 when the institution intends to reclassify to Division III."

- B. Bylaws: Amend 20.5.3.1, page 303, as follows:
[Division II]

"20.5.3.1 Reclassification from Division II to Division I or III. A member of Division II that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I or III per 20.5.2.1 or that has petitioned to reclassify to Division I per 20.5.2.1.1 no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship and no longer shall be eligible to receive Division II Enhancement Fund proceeds."

- C. Bylaws: Amend 21.7.1.1 by adding new 21.7.1.1.3, page 318, as follows:

[Division II]

"21.7.1.1.3 Reclassification from Division II to Division III. If a committee member's institution has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division III per 20.5.2.1, that individual shall not be eligible to serve on any Division II committee."

- D. Bylaws: Amend 31.3.3.6, page 353, as follows:

[Division II]

"31.3.3.6 Exclusion of Institution Reclassifying from Division II to Division I or Division III. In all sports, any Division II institution that has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I or III per 20.5.2.1 or that has petitioned to reclassify to Division I per 20.5.2.1.1 no longer shall be eligible to participate in any subsequent Division II NCAA championship."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000 (for any institution that begins its three-year reclassification compliance period September 1, 2000).

Rationale: Currently, a Division II institution that wishes to reclassify to Division III must only inform the national office June 1 prior to the September 1 in which it wishes to become a Division III member. Further, such an institution remains eligible for Division II championships during the reclassification compliance period. However, in order to meet the reclassification requirements, the Division II institution must have complied with Division III legislation for three years prior to reclassification. In this regard, since these institutions are applying Division III legislation and focused on transitioning to Division III, the institution should not be eligible for selection for Division II championship

onships during this time period, and staff members from the institution should be excluded from service on Division II committees.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 48 (NO. 2-37) CHANGE OF DIVISION MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE SERVICE

Intent: To prohibit institutional staff members and student-athletes from serving on Division II committees when the individual's institution has forwarded to the national office intent to reclassify to Division I.

Bylaws: Amend 21.7.1.1 by adding 21.7.1.1.3, page 318, as follows:
[Division II]

"21.7.1.1.3 Reclassification from Division II to Division I. If a committee member's institution has forwarded to the national office written notice of its intention to change its membership classification to Division I, per 20.5.2.1, that individual shall not be eligible to serve on any Division II committee."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000 (for any institution that begins its two-year reclassification compliance period September 1, 2000).

Rationale: The NCAA Division II Membership Committee believes when a Division II institution forwards its intent to reclassify to Division I, individuals from the institution should no longer serve on Division II committees. These personnel are, at that time, focused on Division I issues and completing the transition to Division I. This doesn't make it possible for such individuals to contribute effectively to conducting the committee's business. The committee believes, that in the best interest of the division, committee service should be restricted to personnel from Division II institutions and should not extend to personnel from reclassifying institutions.

Action: Adopted.

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division III Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division III athletics that prompt widespread concern among Division III chief executive officers.

Legislative proposals developed by the Division III Management Council or by Division III committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Division III Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was

established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division III.

The Division III Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division III chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division III Presidents Council for or against a proposal. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Presidents Council are those identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. All proposals in the Presidents Council grouping are subject to a roll-call vote.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

*NO. 49 (NO. 2-38) *CONDITIONS AND OBLIGATIONS OF CONFERENCE MEMBERSHIP— CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AUTHORITY

Intent: To require institutional chief executive officers to have ultimate responsibility and final authority for the operation of Division III member conferences.

Constitution: Amend 3.3.4 by adding new 3.3.4.6, page 14, as follows:

[Division III]

[3.3.4.1 through 3.3.4.5 unchanged.]

"3.3.4.6 Chief Executive Officer Involvement. Institutional chief executive officers shall have the ultimate responsibility and final authority for the operation of the member conference and the actions of any institution that is a member of that conference."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Membership Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2001.

Rationale: Member conferences should be held to the same standard as member institutions. Currently, institutional chief executive officers are not required to be involved in the operation of the member conference. This legislation is similar to the chief executive officer control legislation in Constitution 6.1.1 applicable to member institutions. It will specify that chief executive officers have the ultimate responsibility and final authority for the operation of NCAA Division III member conferences. In order to provide member conferences sufficient time to implement this legislation, the proposal has an effective date of August 1, 2001.

Action: Adopted, effective August 21, 2001.

*NO. 50 (NO. 2-39) *CONFERENCE STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Intent: To require each Division III multisport member conference to establish a conference student-athlete advisory committee as a condition and obligation of membership.

Constitution: Amend 3.3.4 by adding new 3.3.4.6, page 14, as follows:

[Division III]

[3.3.4.1 through 3.3.4.5 unchanged.]

"3.3.4.6 Conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Each Division III multisport member conference shall establish a student-athlete advisory committee for its student-athletes. The composition and duties of the committee shall be determined by the conference."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation and Student-Athlete Advisory Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2001.

Rationale: The establishment of institutional student-athlete advisory committees has allowed student-athletes to become more involved in the administration of intercollegiate athletics. This proposal will allow Division III student-athletes to become more involved at the regional and national level. It also will permit conferences to address concerns specific to its members by providing them with the authority to establish the responsibilities and compositional requirement of their committees. In order to provide member conferences sufficient time to implement this legislation, the proposal has an effective date of August 1, 2001. Single-sport conferences are not bound by this proposal.

Action: Adopted, 185-69-3, effective August 1, 2001.

*NO. 51 (NO. 2-40) *ALL-STAR CONTESTS

Intent: To delete all references to the all-star contest certification process and to preclude student-athletes in all sports with eligibility remaining from participating in all-star contests.

[Division III]

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1.6, page 52, as follows:

"11.1.6 Involvement in All-Star Contests. Staff members of the athletics department of a member institution shall not knowingly participate, directly or indirectly, in the management, coaching, officiating, supervision, promotion or player selection of any all-star contest involving student-athletes that is not certified by the Association's Special Events Committee."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.7.6, page 110, as follows:

"14.7.6 Collegiate All-Star Contests. A student-athlete who com-

petes as a member of a squad in any college all-star football or basketball contest shall be denied further intercollegiate eligibility in that sport."

C. Bylaws: Amend 30.2.2, pages 284-285, as follows:

"30.2.2 College Football and Basketball. A member institution is prohibited from allowing its facilities to be utilized for any college all-star football or basketball contest unless the contest is certified as meeting the requirements specified below. (See 11.1.6 for regulations governing the involvement of athletics department staff members in all-star football or basketball contests that are not certified.)

"30.2.2.1 Application for Inauguration of Contest. Application for the inauguration of a contest will be received only at a regular meeting of the Management Council, and the committee will approve or disapprove the application at one of its meetings held during the next year. The proposing sponsor shall submit to the committee, with its application form, a projected financial report showing the financial soundness of the proposed game, which would include the amount of revenue currently available to the game, or to which game management may have access, to guarantee game and team expenses. A new all-star game shall secure annually (for a three-year period from its initial-certification date) an irrevocable letter of credit guaranteeing the minimum payout to applicable educational or charitable organization(s), plus an additional 25 percent of projected expenses to cover expenses related to game management, operations and administration.

"30.2.2.2 Conduct of Game. Game management shall provide evidence of the experience it has in conducting all-star games or similar events and conduct the game in accordance with the Association's principles for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, as set forth in Constitution 2 and interpretations relating thereto.

"30.2.2.3 Distribution of Income. The sponsoring agency shall distribute to approved nonprofit educational or charitable organization(s) the greater of the following revenues:

"(a) Ten-thousand dollars from basketball all-star games; \$100,000 from football all-star games in which Divisions I or III student-athletes participate; or \$20,000 from football all-star games in which Division II student-athletes participate;

"(b) Fifteen percent of the gross receipts generated by the all-star game; or

"(c) One-hundred percent of the game's net income.

"30.2.2.3.1 Charitable or Educational Status. Game management shall submit, as part of certification, the name(s) of the organization(s) and appropriate documentation establishing the tax-exempt or not-for-profit status of the charitable/educational organization(s) that will receive a share of its gross receipts.

"30.2.2.4 Eligible Participants. Participation shall be limited to enrolled or graduated student-athletes who have exhausted their seasons of eligibility in the sport but who were eligible to compete on their institution's intercollegiate team in that sport during the preceding season.

"30.2.2.5 Written Permission from Athletics Director. Game management shall obtain written permission from the athletics director of the student-athlete's institution before inviting a student-athlete to compete in its contest.

"30.2.2.6 Date of Football Game. A certified college all-star football game shall be played on or before January 21 during the academic year in which the participating student-athletes have exhausted their seasons of eligibility in the sport.

"30.2.2.6.1 Management Council Waiver. The Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, may waive the January 21 date.

"30.2.2.7 Insurance. The management of each certified game shall provide the following insurance coverages and submit to the national office, no later than 60 days prior to the game, the appropriate certification of insurance showing evidence of such coverages:

"(a) Basic accident-medical insurance for each participating student-athlete in the amount of \$25,000 per injury;

"(b) Catastrophic-injury medical insurance for each participating student-athlete that provides lifetime medical, rehabilitation and disability benefits in excess of the basic coverage, equal to the NCAA-sponsored program or an alternate program approved by the Management Council; and

"(c) Primary comprehensive general liability coverage listing the NCAA as an additional insured, with combined single limits of at least \$1 million per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage.

"(d) Coverages in (a) and (b) shall be in effect while the participating student-athletes are traveling to and from the all-star game site and while they are in the host city.

"30.2.2.8 Awards. Awards shall be subject to the restrictions set forth in 16.1.

"30.2.2.9 Tickets. Game management shall sell tickets at face value for at least 40 percent of the capacity of the stadium or arena where the contest will occur.

"30.2.2.10 Application for Recertification of Contest. Application for recertification of a contest shall be received in the national office not later than July 1. Any application received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 24. Failure to submit the appropriate information by that date or to comply with the requirements set forth by the Management Council may result in a decision not to certify the event.

"30.2.2.11 Certification Fee. Each all-star game annually

shall pay to the Association a \$1,000 certification fee upon notice of certification.

"30.2.2.12 Financial Report of Previous Game. The management of each certified game shall submit to the Management Council an audited financial report certified by an independent accounting firm of the immediate past game before an ensuing contest may be certified. All materials shall be received in the national office by mail or wired transmission not later than July 1. Any report received after that date shall be postmarked not later than June 24. Failure to submit the appropriate information by that date may result in a decision not to recertify the event."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This proposal addresses three issues — involvement by institutional staff members in all-star contests; participation by student-athletes with eligibility remaining in all-star contests; and the use of institutional facilities for such contests. Part A of this proposal permits institutional staff members to be involved in the conduct and operation of all-star contests. Current legislation precludes such involvement unless the contest is certified by the NCAA. Part B extends the current legislation by prohibiting all student-athletes, not just basketball and football student-athletes, with remaining eligibility from competing in all-star contests. Part C permits institutional facilities to be used for all-star contests with the understanding that the institution assumes all inherent risks involved with the all-star contest. Current legislation precludes such use unless the all-star contest is certified by meeting the requirements in Bylaw 30.2.2. Accordingly, this proposal provides Division III institutions with the ultimate authority to determine the involvement of institutional personnel, equipment and facilities in all-star contests.

Action: Adopted, 245-0-0.

***NO. 52 (NO. 2-43) SEASON OF COMPETITION —
MINIMUM AMOUNT OF
COMPETITION**

Intent: To eliminate scrimmages with outside competition from counting as a season of competition for student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1, page 102, as follows:
[Division III]

"14.2.4.1 Minimum Amount of Competition. Any competition [including scrimmage with outside competition (except for approved two-year college scrimmages per 14.2.4.1.1)] regardless of time, during a season in an intercollegiate sport shall be counted as a season of competition in that sport. **A season of competition shall be counted when a student-athlete participates in**

any regular-season or postseason intercollegiate competition. This provision is applicable to intercollegiate athletics competition conducted by a two-year or four-year collegiate institution at the varsity or subvarsity level."

B. Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.1.1, page 102, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.2.4.1.1 Exception—Two-Year College Scrimmages. Participation in a two-year college scrimmage shall be exempt from counting as a season of competition, provided the competition meets all of the following conditions:

"(a) The scrimmage is approved by the two-year college;

"(b) No official score is kept;

"(c) No admission is charged;

"(d) No official time is kept;

"(e) The scrimmage is played prior to the two-year college's first regularly scheduled outside competition; and

"(f) The student-athlete participates in not more than two such scrimmages or dates of competition per academic year."

Source: All members of the State University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: At the present time, most Division III institutions use preseason scrimmages with outside competition as a means to select student-athletes for teams. When a student-athlete participates in tryouts by scrimmaging and is then cut from the squad, a season of competition is charged to the athlete. This deprives the athlete from a full year of participation.

Committee Position (Division III Administrative Review Subcommittee): The Division III Administrative Review Subcommittee supports the proposal with concerns expressed regarding the inclusion of exhibition contests. Further, the subcommittee expressed concern how the permissible number of scrimmages may be affected by this legislation.

Action: Adopted, 193-32-4.

***NO. 53 (NO. 2-46) TWO-YEAR COLLEGE TRANSFERS —
TWO-YEAR NONPARTICIPATION
EXCEPTION**

Intent: To permit two-year college transfer students to use the same two-year nonparticipation exception that is available to four-year college transfer students.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.4.3 by adding new 14.5.4.3.1, page 107, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.5.4.3 To Division III Institutions. A student who has not pre-

viously participated in intercollegiate athletics and who transfers from a two-year college or from a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program to a Division III member institution shall be immediately eligible, under the Association's transfer regulations, to compete for the Division III institution, including NCAA championship competition. If the student has ever participated in intercollegiate athletics, the student must have been academically and athletically eligible had he or she remained at that institution. Further, a student who has ever participated in intercollegiate athletics and transfers from a four-year institution to a two-year college, and then to the certifying institution, also must have been athletically and academically eligible had he or she remained at the previous four-year institution or must have successfully completed at least 24 semester or 36 quarter hours of transferable-degree credit and spent at least two semesters or three quarters of attendance at the two-year college.

"14.5.4.3.1 Two-Year Nonparticipation Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from a two-year college or from a branch school that conducts an intercollegiate athletics program and, for a consecutive two-year period immediately prior to the date on which the student begins participation (practice and/or competition), the student has neither practiced nor competed in the involved sport in intercollegiate competition, or has neither practiced or competed in organized noncollegiate amateur competition while enrolled as full-time student in a collegiate institution. This two-year period does not include any period of time prior to the student's initial collegiate enrollment."

Source: All members of the Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This legislation would allow students who attend a two-year college the same two-year nonparticipation transfer exception currently available to four-year college transfers.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council Academic Issues Subcommittee): The subcommittee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted, 239-3-1, effective immediately.

***NO. 54 (NO. 2-54) MAXIMUM CONTEST LIMITATIONS
STUDENT-ATHLETE - BASKETBALL,
FIELD HOCKEY AND SOCCER**

Intent: In the sports of Division III basketball, field hockey and soccer, to permit a student-athlete to participate in one junior var-

sity contest and one varsity contest on the same day and at the same site and have such participation count as only one contest.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 17.5.5.1.3 by adding new 17.5.5.1.3.1, page 162, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.5.5.1.3 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in not more than 28 basketball contests in Division I, 27 contests in Division II or 25 contests in Division III. This limitation includes those contests in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution. Further, an individual student-athlete may participate each year in only one postseason basketball tournament as a member of the institution's varsity, junior varsity or freshman team.

"17.5.5.1.3.1 Varsity and Junior Varsity Doubleheader—Division III. A student-athlete who competes in one junior varsity contest and one varsity contest on the same day and at the same site shall be considered to have competed in only one contest."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 17.9.5.2 by adding new 17.9.5.2.1, page 173, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.9.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 20 field hockey contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition in field hockey during another segment. This limitation includes those contests or dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

"17.9.5.2.1 Varsity and Junior Varsity Doubleheader—Division III. A student-athlete who competes in one junior varsity contest and one varsity contest on the same day and at the same site shall be considered to have competed in only one contest."

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 17.18.5.1.3 by adding new 17.18.5.1.3.1, page 200, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.18.5.1.3 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. In all divisions, an individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 20 soccer contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and five dates of competition in soccer during another segment. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition

as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution.

"17.18.5.1.3.1 Varsity and Junior Varsity Doubleheader—Division III. A student-athlete who competes in one junior varsity contest and one varsity contest on the same day and at the same site shall be considered to have competed in only one contest."

Source: All members of the Centennial Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Many institutions with almost, but not quite enough, student-athletes to field two full squads (including substitutes) in the sports of basketball, field hockey and soccer are currently dressing, feeding and taking students out of class hoping that all of the team members, including the less skilled ones, will have the opportunity to play. It is hoped that this proposed legislation will provide increased opportunity for competition without expanding the institutional season limitations.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittee): The subcommittee did not support this proposal. The subcommittee expressed concerns that the proposal only relates to a select number of team sports and the absence of a limitation on the number of dates that can be utilized and the potential for abuse. The subcommittee also noted potential health and safety issues for student-athletes.

Action: Withdrawn.

**NO. 55 (NO. 2-53) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— COMPETITION IN —
NONTRADITIONAL SEGMENT**

Intent: To prohibit Division III institutions from competing against outside competition during the nontraditional segment, except in the sports of golf and tennis per Bylaw 17.1.11.4.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.1.11.3, page 152, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.1.11.3 Dividing Traditional and Nontraditional Segments—Division III. A member institution that divides its practice and playing season into two distinct segments per 17.1.3 and conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall must complete all practice and competition by October 30 of the academic year involved; conversely, a member institution that conducts its traditional segment in the fall may not begin practice or competition during its nontraditional segment until February 1 of the academic year involved."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.2 through 17.28, pages 152-233, for each Division III sport by amending the respective sections enti-

tled first date of competition and end of regular season, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.3 First Date of Competition. A member institution shall not engage in its first date of competition (game or scrimmage) with outside competition in _____ prior to the following dates:

"(b) Division III.

(1) *Traditional Segment.* September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier

(2) *Nontraditional Segment.* September 7 or the institution's first day of classes for the fall term, whichever is earlier.

"17.4 End of Regular Season. A member institution shall conclude all practice and competition (meets and practice meets) in each segment in _____ by the following dates:

"(b) Division III

(1) *Traditional Segment.* The conclusion of the national governing body championship in _____.

(2) *Nontraditional Segment.* The last date of final examinations for the regular academic year at the institution."

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5.1, page 158, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.4.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of baseball during the institution's baseball playing season to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.4.5.3:

"(b) Division III—45 (with not more than 36 during the traditional segment) [see also 17.4.3-(b)-(1)]."

D. Bylaws: Amend 17.4.5.2, page 159, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.4.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of baseball contests (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

"(b) Division III—45 (with not more than 36 during the traditional segment)."

E. Bylaws: Amend 17.9.5.1, page 173 as follows:

[Division III]

"17.9.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. In all divisions, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of field hockey during the institution's field hockey playing season in any one year to 20 con-

tests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted *and five dates of competition during another segment*, except for those contests or dates of competition excluded under 17.9.5.3, 17.9.5.4 and 17.9.5.8 [see also 17.9.3.(b)-(1)]."

[17.9.5.1.2 unchanged.]

F. Bylaws: Amend 17.9.5.2, page 173, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.9.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 20 field hockey contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted *and five dates of competition in field hockey during another segment*. This limitation includes those contests or dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

G. Bylaws: Amend 17.18.5.1, page 200, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.18.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. In all divisions, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of soccer during the institution's soccer playing season in any one year to 20 contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted *and five dates of competition during another segment*, except for those contests and/or dates of competition excluded under 17.18.5.2, 17.18.5.3 and 17.18.5.7 [see also 17.18.3.(b)-(1)]."

[17.18.5.1.1 through 17.18.5.1.2 unchanged.]

H. Bylaws: Amend 17.18.5.1.3, page 200, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.18.5.1.3 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. In all divisions, an individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 20 soccer contests during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted *and five dates of competition in soccer during another segment*. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

I. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.5.1, page 203, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.19.5.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of softball during the institution's softball playing season to the following number of contests (games and scrimmages), except for those contests excluded under 17.19.5.3:

"(b) Division III—45 (*with not more than 36 during the traditional segment*)."

J. Bylaws: Amend 17.19.5.2, page 203, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.19.5.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in the following number of softball contests (this limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

"(b) Division III—45 (*with not more than 36 during the traditional segment*)."

K. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.7.1, page 224, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.26.7.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of women's volleyball during the institution's women's volleyball playing season to the following number of dates of competition, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.26.9:

"(b) Division III—22 during the traditional segment *and five during the nontraditional segment* [see also 17.26.3.(b)-(1)]."

[17.26.7.1.1 unchanged.]

L. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.7.2, page 224, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.26.7.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete—Women. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in the following dates of competition in women's volleyball (this limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student-athlete represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution):

"(b) Division III—22 during the traditional segment *and five during the nontraditional segment*."

M. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.8, page 224, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.26.8 Number of Dates of Competition—Men

"17.26.8.1 Maximum Limitations—Institutional. A member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of men's volleyball during the institution's men's volleyball playing season to not more than 28 dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted *and not more than four dates of competition during another segment*, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.26.9."

[17.26.8.1.1 unchanged.]

N. Bylaws: Amend 17.26.8.2, page 224, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.26.8.2 Maximum Limitations—Student-Athlete—Men. An individual student-athlete may participate each academic year in not more than 28 dates of competition in men's volleyball during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted and not more than four dates of competition during another segment. This limitation includes those dates of competition in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Competition beyond the traditional segment undermines the academic mission of Division III institutions and such competition is not necessary. Further, such competition is inconsistent with the Division III philosophy. This proposal will reduce demands and challenges placed on institutional resources and personnel, yet retain the benefit and value of practice during the nontraditional segment. Further, eliminating competition in the nontraditional segment allows students-athletes the opportunity to focus on other campus activities. In accordance with NCAA Bylaw 17.1.11.4, a member institution that conducts its nontraditional segment in the fall and that schedules more than 50 percent of its contests or dates of competition (including the conference championship) in the nontraditional segment may elect to utilize the preseason practice and first-date-of-competition regulations applicable to the traditional segment.

Action: Referred as amended to the Division III Presidents Council, 192-143-1.

***NO. 56 (NO. 2-58) WOMEN'S CHAMPIONSHIPS —
SPONSORSHIP CRITERIA
MINIMUM PERIOD**

Intent: To specify that a new championship may be established in a women's sport if the minimum number of sponsoring institutions exist for one academic year (rather than for two consecutive academic years.)

Bylaws: Amend 18.2.4.2.1, page 236, as follows:
[Division III]

"18.2.4 Championships Established during 1994-95 or Later

"18.2.4.2 Sponsorship Criteria

"18.2.4.2.1 Minimum Period. **In men's sports,** The applicable minimum sponsorship number must exist for two consecutive academic years in order for a championship to be established. Legislation to establish the championship may be proposed during the second year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. **In women's sports, the applicable minimum sponsorship num-**

ber must exist for one academic year in order for a championship to be established. Legislation to establish the championship may be proposed during the year in which the minimum sponsorship number exists. Varsity sports sponsored prior to August 1, 1994, shall count toward the *two-consecutive applicable minimum-year sponsorship requirement.*"

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Bylaws 18.2.4.1 and 18.2.4.2.1 currently specify that a championship may be established in a new women's sport if at least 40 institutions sponsor the sport, and that such legislation may be established after the sport has met the minimum requirement for two consecutive years. The Championships Committee reviewed the sponsorship of the emerging sports of women's water polo (37 institutions), women's ice hockey (40), women's squash (27) and women's bowling (21). If the waiting period were reduced from two years to one year, legislation could be proposed in 1999-00 to establish a women's ice hockey championship in 2000-01. It is anticipated that sponsorship of women's water polo will reach 40 by the end of the 1999 academic year; if that occurs, legislation also could be proposed in 1999-00 to establish a women's water polo championship in 2000-01. This proposal will assist member institutions in meeting their legal obligations under Title IX.

Action: Adopted, 266-18-5.

***NO. 57 (NO. 2-59) NATIONAL COLLEGIATE
CHAMPIONSHIP — WOMEN'S ICE
HOCKEY**

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Championship in the sport of women's ice hockey, effective 2000-01, and to establish a women's ice hockey committee as specified.

[Note: The proposed changes involve common provisions, and thus, must be approved by Divisions I, II and III acting independently.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.3.1, page 237, as follows:
[Division III]

"18.3.1 National Collegiate Championships (9 10)

Men (3)	Men and Women (3)	Women (3 4)
Gymnastics	Fencing	Gymnastics
Volleyball	Rifle	Ice Hockey
Water Polo	Skiing	Lacrosse (Divisions I and II only)
		Rowing"

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.3 by adding new 21.3.2, pages 269-271, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]
"21.3 COMMON COMMITTEES—COMMITTEES WITH PLAYING RULES AND CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

"21.3.2 Ice Hockey Committee, Women's. The Women's Ice Hockey Committee shall consist of seven members, including the secretary-rules editor."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In an effort to increase championship opportunities for women, selected NCAA sports, such as women's ice hockey, have been chosen to establish a National Collegiate Championship. Currently, 40 member institutions sponsor the sport of women's ice hockey. The establishment of a championship for women's ice hockey necessitates the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administration responsibilities. It is desirable that the composition of the sports committee reflects sports-sponsorship data.

Action: Adopted, 262-3-17.

***NO. 58 (NO. 2-60) NATIONAL COLLEGIATE CHAMPIONSHIP—WOMEN'S WATER POLO**

Intent: To establish a National Collegiate Championship in the sport of women's water polo, effective 2000-01, and to establish a women's water polo committee.

[Note: The proposed changes involve common provisions, and thus, must be approved by Divisions I, II and III acting independently.]

A. Bylaws: Amend 18.3.1, page 237, as follows:
 [Division III]

"18.3.1 National Collegiate Championships (9 10)
"Men (3) Men and Women (3) Women (3 4)
 Gymnastics Fencing Gymnastics
 Volleyball Rifle Lacrosse (Divisions I
 Water Polo Skiing and II only)
 Rowing
Water Polo"

B. Bylaws: Amend 21.3, by adding new 21.3.8, pages 269-271, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Common provision, all divisions, divided vote]

"21.3 COMMON COMMITTEES—COMMITTEES WITH PLAYING RULES AND CHAMPIONSHIPS ADMINISTRATION RESPONSIBILITIES

"21.3.8 Water Polo Committee, Women's. The Women's Water Polo Committee shall consist of six members,

including the secretary-rules editor."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Championships Committee)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In an effort to increase NCAA championship opportunities for women, selected NCAA sports, such as women's water polo, have been chosen to establish a National Collegiate Championship. If 40 institutions do not sponsor water polo during the 1999-00 academic year, the sponsors will request that the governance structure rescind the adoption of this legislation prior to 2000-01. The establishment of a championship for women's water polo necessitates the development of a committee with playing rules and championship administration responsibilities. It is desirable that the composition of the sports committee reflects sport-sponsorship data.

Action: Adopted, 278-8-12.

DEREGULATION PACKAGE

NO. 59 (Dereg. 1) CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL — ENDORSEMENT OF COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS

Intent: To eliminate the prohibition of athletics department's staff members using the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior approval by the institution's chief executive officer.

A. Bylaws: Amend 11.1.4, page 51, as follows:
 [Division III]

"11.1.4 Use of Institutional Name or Logo. Athletics department staff members shall not use, directly or by implication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution."

B. Bylaws: Amend 11.3.2.5, page 53, as follows:
 [Division III]

"11.3.2.5 Endorsement of Commercial Products. Athletics department staff members shall not use, directly or by implication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer in Divisions I and II and without prior approval from the institution in Division III."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation, the committee believes that it is not necessary to legislate the prohibition of athletics department's staff members utilizing, directly or by implication, the institution's name or logo in the endorsement of commercial products or services for personal gain without prior written approval from the institution's chief executive officer. The committee believes that the institution and copyright laws governing the use of institutional names and logos adequately address this issue.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 60 (Dereg. 2) CONDUCT OF ATHLETICS PERSONNEL
— INCOME FROM SALE OF STOCK —**

Intent: To delete legislation that directly governs an institution's staff member from realizing income from the sale of stock in a professional sports organization.

Bylaws: Amend 11.3.3.2.3, page 54, as follows:
[Division III]

"11.3.3.2.3 Income from the Sale of Stock. A staff member may purchase and realize income from the sale of stock in a professional sports organization only if such a purchase does not place the staff member in a position of administrative or supervisory control of that organization."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this legislation relating to institutional staff members purchasing and realizing income from the sale of stock in a professional sports organization. The committee noted that more stringent legislation in Bylaw 11.3.3.1 would preclude a staff member from being in a position of administrative or supervisory control of a professional sports organization.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 61 (Dereg. 3) AMATEURISM — FUNDS FROM
PROFESSIONAL SPORTS
ORGANIZATION**

Intent: To delete the list of conditions that preclude a member institution from accepting funds from a professional sports organization.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.6.1.5, page 68, as follows:

A-70

Legislative Proposals

[Division III]

"12.6.1.5 To Institution, Nonpermissible. A member institution shall not accept funds from a professional sports organization if:

"(a) The funds are for the purpose of recognizing the development of a former student-athlete in a particular sport. The receipt of such funds by an institution would make additional moneys available that could benefit student-athletes and thus result in student-athletes indirectly receiving funds from a professional sports organization;

"(b) The money, even though not earmarked by the donor, is received and credited to institutional funds for the financial assistance of student-athletes generally; or

"(c) The money is placed in the institution's general fund and credited to the athletics department for an unspecified purpose."

Source: NCAA Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee believes that Bylaw 12.6.1.4 adequately states the conditions that must be satisfied before a member institution may accept funds from a professional sports organization. In the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this bylaw.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 62 (Dereg. 4) RECRUITING — NONPERMISSIBLE
LISTS**

Intent: To delete nonpermissible lists that relate to Bylaws 13.02.5.2, 13.4.4.1 and 13.6.1.1.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.02.5.2, page 72, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.02.5.2 Impermissible Recruitment Activities for Enrolled Student-Athletes:

"(a) Recruitment expenses. An institution may not provide an enrolled student-athlete with transportation or expenses to recruit a prospect except those expenses specified as permissible when a student-athlete serves as a student host.

"(c) Transportation. A student-athlete acting as a student host shall not be provided an automobile by the institution or representatives of its athletics interests for use by the host or the prospect during a prospect's official visit to the campus.

"(d) Student host. A student-athlete serving as a student host must be enrolled in the member institution being visited by the prospect. In Divisions I and II, a nonqualifier (see

Legislative Proposals

A-71

14.02.9) may not serve as a student host during his or her first academic year of residence."

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.4.1, page 77, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.4.4.1 Nonpermissible Items. The gift from a Division III institution of any tangible recruiting aid other than those permitted in 13.4.4 shall be considered an improper recruiting inducement."

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 13.6.1.1, page 78, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.6.1.1 Nonpermissible Transportation. If nonpermissible transportation is provided, the institution may not avoid a violation of this rule by receiving reimbursement for mileage from the prospect."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of these lists of nonpermissible activities. The committee believes that the permissible list is exhaustive. If an activity is not listed on the permissible list, it is not permissible.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 63 (Dereg. 5) NONPERMISSIBLE RECRUITING EXPENSES

Intent: To delete legislation that precludes an institution from providing a student-athlete with transportation or expenses to recruit a prospect except when a student-athlete serves as a student host.

Bylaws: Amend 13.1.2.8, page 75, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.1.2.8 Student-Athlete. An institution may not provide an enrolled student-athlete with transportation or expenses to recruit a prospect except those expenses specified in 13.7.5.5 when the student-athlete serves as a student host."

Source: Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In accordance with Bylaw 13.7.5.5, an institution may only provide \$20 a day, a complimentary meal and complimentary admission to a campus athletics event to a student-athlete that is hosting a prospect on an official visit and may not provide a student-athlete any other expenses to recruit a prospect. Thus, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this bylaw.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 64 (Dereg. 6) TRANSPORTATION ON AN OFFICIAL VISIT

Intent: To delete legislation relating to transportation on an official visit.

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.2.1, page 78, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.6.2.1 General Restrictions. A member institution may pay the prospect's actual round-trip transportation costs for his or her official visit to its campus, provided a direct route between the prospect's home and the institution's campus is used. Use of a limousine or helicopter for such transportation is prohibited."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Bylaw 13.5.1 only permits an institution to entertain prospects on a scale comparable to that of normal student life. The committee agreed that the use of a limousine or helicopter while entertaining a prospect is clearly not on a scale comparable to that of normal student life. Thus, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this legislation.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 65 (Dereg. 7) ENTERTAINMENT, REIMBURSEMENT AND EMPLOYMENT OF HIGH SCHOOL/COLLEGE-PREPARATORY SCHOOL/TWO-YEAR COLLEGE COACHES

Intent: To amend legislation relating to entertainment of a high-school, college-preparatory school or two-year college coach by an institutional staff member.

Bylaws: Amend 13.9.1, page 84, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.9.1 Entertainment Restrictions. Entertainment of a high-school, college-preparatory school or two-year college coach or any other individual responsible for teaching or directing an activity in which a prospect is involved shall be confined to a member institution's campus and shall be limited to providing a maximum of two complimentary admissions (in Division I, issued only through a pass list) to home athletics contests that must be issued on an individual-game basis in Divisions I and II but may be extended to include full-season passes or tickets in Division III not to exceed full-season passes or tickets. Such entertainment shall not include food and refreshments, room expenses, or the cost of transportation to and from the campus. An institutional coaching staff member is expressly prohibited from

spending funds to entertain the prospect's coach on or off the member institution's campus."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Bylaw 13.9.1 states that a member institution's coach may only entertain a high-school/college-preparatory school/two-year college coach on a member institution's campus and may only include two complimentary admissions. Thus, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this legislation.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 66 (Dereg. 8) PUBLICITY — COMMENTS ON PROSPECTS

Intent: To amend legislation relating to an institution commenting on a prospect's ability.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.2, page 86, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.11.2 Comments Prior to Signing. Prior to the signing of a prospect to a National Letter of Intent or an institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid, a member institution may comment publicly only to the extent of confirming its recruitment of the prospect. The institution may not comment generally about the prospect's ability or the contribution that the prospect might make to the institution's team; further, the institution is precluded from commenting in any manner as to the likelihood of the prospect's signing with that institution. Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."

Source: Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: This bylaw sets forth instances in which an institution may not comment on a prospect, similar to a list of nonpermissibles. Thus, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this bylaw.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 67 (Dereg. 9) PUBLICITY — INTENT TO ENROLL

Intent: To delete legislation that prohibits an institution from publicizing a prospect's intention to enroll.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.6, page 86, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.11.6 Intent to Enroll. A member institution shall not publi-

cize (or arrange for publicity of) a prospect's intention to accept its offer of financial assistance. Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."

Source: Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee believes that Bylaw 13.11.2, which only permits an institution to comment publicly only to the extent of confirming its recruitment of a prospect, is more restrictive than 13.11.6. Thus, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this bylaw.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 68 (Dereg. 10) ANNOUNCEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE

Intent: To amend legislation relating to the announcement of a prospect's acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission.

Bylaws: Amend 13.11.8, page 86, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.11.8 Announcement of Signing Acceptance. Publicity released by an institution concerning a prospect's commitment to attend the institution shall occur only after the prospect has signed a National Letter of Intent or subsequent to the prospect's signed paid acceptance of the institution's written offer of admission and/or financial aid. Such communications shall be limited to those media forms normally used by the institution and by the educational institutions currently and formerly attended by the prospect. Violations of this bylaw do not affect a prospect's eligibility; however, the violation shall be considered an institutional violation per 2.8.1."

"13.11.8.1 Media Outlets. Such communications shall be released only to those media outlets normally used by the institution and by the educational institutions currently and formerly attended by the prospect."

"13.11.8.2 Press Conferences. Institutional press conferences, receptions, dinners and similar meetings held for the purpose of making such an announcement are expressly prohibited."

"13.11.8.2.1 One-Time Exception—Announcement of All Signings. An institution may make an announcement on the institution's campus for the sole purpose of presenting at one time to the media the names of all prospects who have accepted offers of admission and/or athletically related aid in a particular sport from that institution, with the understanding that no prospects (or their friends or relatives) may be in attendance."

"13.11.8.4 Signings On Campus. An institution is responsible for signings on its campus (whether involving an individual or a group of prospects). Any contact by the media with prospects on campus during the time the prospect signs a National Letter of Intent or tender of financial aid shall be considered to be prima facie evidence of institutional involvement in arranging media involvement and shall be prohibited."

"13.11.8.5 Press-Release Content. The contents of a properly issued press release may be determined by the institution and may include comments by its coaching staff members about the abilities of the prospect."

[13.11.8.3 unchanged.]

Source: Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee agreed that this legislation is not appropriate to Division III. This proposal would permit institutions to announce a prospect's paid acceptance (i.e., room deposit) through media forms normally used by the institution. Further, this proposal would prohibit the one-time announcement of signings unless the institution conducts such an event on a regular basis.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 69 (Dereg. 11): USE OF RECRUITING FUNDS

Intent: To delete legislation relating to the use of recruiting funds.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.15.4.1, page 92, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.15.4.1 Pooled Resources. The pooling of resources for recruiting purposes by two or more persons shall constitute such a slush fund. However, this provision shall not apply to persons upon whom a prospect may be naturally or legally dependent."

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.15.4.2, page 93, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.15.4.2 Company Funds. The use of a company's funds to pay the expenses incurred in transporting a prospect to the campus constitutes the use of pooled resources."

Source: Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee believes that Bylaw 13.15.4 sufficiently states that an institution may not permit an outside organization, agency or group of individuals to utilize, administer or expend funds for recruiting purposes on behalf of the institution. Thus, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of these bylaws.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 70 (Dereg. 12): SUMMER FINANCIAL AID

Intent: To permit Division III institutions to provide summer financial aid to student-athletes in accordance with institutional policy applicable to the general student body.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.8, pages 119-120, as follows:

[Division III]

"15.2.8 Summer Financial Aid. Summer financial aid may be awarded to student-athletes in accordance with institutional policies applicable to the general student body."

"15.2.8.1 General Stipulations. A student-athlete who is eligible for institutional financial aid during the summer is not required to be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies. However, the student-athlete may not receive financial aid that exceeds the cost of a full grant-in-aid for attendance in that summer term."

"15.2.8.1.2 Summer Financial Aid—Prior to Initial, Full-Time Collegiate Enrollment. The following conditions apply to the awarding of financial aid to a student-athlete to attend an institution in the summer prior to the student's initial, full-time collegiate enrollment:

"(a) The recipient shall be admitted to the awarding member institution in accordance with regular, published entrance requirements;

"(b) The recipient, if recruited, is subject to NCAA transfer provisions pursuant to 14.5.2-(h);

"(c) During the summer term or orientation period, the recipient shall not engage in any organized athletics practice activities (see 17.02.1.1);

"(d) The awarding institution certifies in writing that the student's financial aid was granted without regard in any degree to athletics ability. The written certification shall be on file in the office of the director of athletics and shall be signed by the faculty athletics representative and the director of financial aid."

"15.2.8.2 Separate Award Required. It is necessary to make an additional award for a summer term, inasmuch as a member institution is limited to the award of financial aid for a period not in excess of one academic year."

[15.2.8.3 unchanged.]

"15.2.8.4 Branch School. An institution may not provide a student-athlete with financial aid to attend a summer session at a branch campus of the institution."

[15.2.8.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The Division III philosophy states that student-athletes should not be treated differently than other members of the student body. Accordingly, summer financial aid provided to student-athletes should conform to institutional policies that are applicable to the general student body.

Action: Adopted.

**NO. 71 (Dereg. 13) AWARDS/BENEFITS —
NONPERMISSIBLE LISTS**

Intent: To delete nonpermissible lists relating to awards and benefits that an institution may provide to student-athletes.

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.1.7.1, pages 128-129, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.1.7.1 Home-Town Awards. A member institution, its booster club or any other organization may not pay the expenses of any student-athlete returning home to receive an award for athletics accomplishments or for other personal purposes. The student-athlete may return home at his or her own expense to attend a recognition event and receive an award from any home-town group (e.g., alumni club) that is not the institution's local athletics booster group."

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.3.3, page 130, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.3.3 Nonpermissible. Services that may not be financed by the institution include, but are not limited to, the following:

"(a) Typing costs, even if typed reports and other papers are a requirement of a course in which a student-athlete is enrolled. Typing costs are not considered an institutional fee under NCAA legislation, and payment would be considered an extra benefit not available to the general student body;

"(b) Course supplies (e.g., calculators, art supplies); and

"(c) Use of a copy machine only for student-athletes."

C. Bylaws: Amend 16.4.2, page 131, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.4.2 Nonpermissible. Student-athlete medical expense benefits that may not be financed by the institution are:

"(a) Student health insurance, if the insurance is provided or offered to the general student body only on an optional basis, except that if such insurance is required for a particular group of students (e.g., foreign students), such expenses may be paid for student-athletes who are members of such a group. Only such required fees may be paid as a part of an institutional grant-in-aid for student-athletes;

"(b) Surgical expenses to treat a student-athlete's illness or injury that was not a result of practice for or participation in inter-

collegiate athletics at the institution and did not occur during voluntary physical activities that will prepare the student-athlete for competition;

"(c) Medical or hospital expenses incurred as the result of an injury while going to or from class, or while participating in classroom requirements (e.g., physical education), unless similar services are provided by the institution to all students or by the terms and conditions of the institution's over-all insurance program; and

"(d) Teeth cleaning, provisional filling of teeth or other dental work, unless the dental work is directly related to injury to the teeth that occurred during practice or competition."

D. Bylaws: Amend 16.5.2, page 132, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.5.2 Nonpermissible

"16.5.2.1 Housing Benefits. The institution may not provide an on-campus or off-campus housing benefit (e.g., individual television sets or stereo equipment, a recreation room or a centralized television room, room furnishings or appointments of extra quality or quantity) for student-athletes that is not available on the same basis to the general student body. The material benefits in question are permissible only if provided in approximately the same ratio to at least one-half of all other students utilizing on-campus housing facilities. Otherwise, dormitories with exclusive material housing benefits may not be utilized by student-athletes."

E. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.2, page 133, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.6.2 Nonpermissible. An institution may not provide any other expenses (except as permitted in 16.6.1 and 16.13) to a student-athlete's friends or relatives.

"16.6.2.1 Expenses for Visits by Friends and Relatives. An institution or any of its athletics representatives may not provide payment of any expenses (e.g., room, board, transportation) for friends or relatives to visit a student-athlete at the institution where he or she is enrolled.

"16.6.2.2 Expenses for Friends and Relatives to Attend Recognition Events. An institution or any of its athletics representatives may not provide the friends or relatives of student-athletes free admissions or meals in conjunction with the institution's or booster club's recognition banquet.

"16.6.2.3 Expenses for Spouse to Attend All-Star Game. An institution or any of its athletics representatives may not provide payment of expenses for the student-athlete's spouse to accompany him or her to a postseason all-star football or basketball game. Provision of such expenses is considered an extra benefit to the relative of a student-athlete that is not available to the relatives of the general student body.

"16.6.2.4 Other Expenses. An institution may not provide any other expenses (except as permitted in 16.6.1 and 16.13) to a student-athlete's friends or relatives."

"16.6.2.5 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.6.2 in which the value of the benefit received by a student-athlete's friend or relative is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations, per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

F. Bylaws: Amend 16.8.2, page 136, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.8.2 Nonpermissible

"16.8.2.1 Travel Apparel. An institution may not provide to student-athletes team travel outfits, blazers or other items of clothing that are not sports-related practice or competition apparel."

"16.8.2.2 Transportation to/from Student-Athlete's Residence. An institution may not provide transportation (e.g., shuttle, van) to on-campus practice sites for student-athletes traveling to and from their on- or off-campus residences, except in unusual situations involving danger, inclement weather or other similar extenuating circumstances."

"16.8.2.3 Reimbursement for Travel to Practice. An institution may not reimburse a student-athlete if the individual provides his or her own transportation to attend practice at an on- or off-campus site."

"16.8.2.4 Reimbursement for Travel to Competition. An institution may not reimburse a student-athlete for expenses incurred while driving to an institution's off-campus competition site if the parents (or other relatives or friends) accompany the student-athlete to the competition site."

"16.8.2.5 Pregame Housing—Division III. An institution may not provide on- or off-campus housing that is separate from the student-athlete's regular housing prior to a regular-season home contest in any sport on those days when institutional dormitories are open."

"16.8.2.6 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.8.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the

receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations, per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

G. Bylaws: Amend 16.10.2, page 138, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.10.2 Nonpermissible

"16.10.2.1 Automobile. An institution may not provide the student-athlete with an automobile, under any circumstances."

"16.10.2.2 Returning Home to Receive Award. An institution may not pay the expenses of any student-athlete returning home to receive an award for athletics accomplishments or for other personal purposes."

"16.10.2.3 Summer Job. An institution may not pay a student-athlete's transportation expenses to or from his or her summer job, unless such expenses are paid for all employees in that situation. (See 13.13.2.1.1 for additional restrictions governing the employment of student-athletes by camps or clinics.)"

"16.10.2.4 Outside Event. An institution may not pay transportation or other expenses for a student-athlete to attend any athletics event when he or she is not representing the institution, except for established national championships (including junior national championships); Olympic, Pan American, World Championships, World Cup and World University Games qualifying competition."

"16.10.2.5 Fellowship of Christian Athletes. An institution may not pay transportation or other expenses for a student-athlete to attend Fellowship of Christian Athletes encampments (see 16.11.1.3)."

"16.10.2.6 Single-Game Promotional Media Events. An institution may not pay transportation or other expenses for a student-athlete to attend special or single-game promotional media events that are not regularly established local media functions."

"16.10.2.7 Reimbursement for Transportation. An institution or its staff member may not provide transportation (e.g., a ride home with a coach) to an enrolled student-athlete even if the student-athlete reimburses the institution or its staff member for the appropriate amount of the gas expense."

"16.10.2.8 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.10.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain

ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations, per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

H. Bylaws: Amend 16.11.2, pages 139-140, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.11.2 Nonpermissible

"16.11.2.1 Unitemized Expenses. A student-athlete may not accept money for unspecified or unitemized expenses from any organization or individual.

"16.11.2.2 Prohibited Expenses. A student-athlete may not accept money for expenses that are prohibited by the rules governing an amateur noncollegiate event in which the individual participates.

"16.11.2.3 Broken-Time Payments. The receipt by a student-athlete of compensation for a financial loss resulting from absence from employment (i.e., "broken-time" payments), except as permitted in 12.4.2.2, 16.11.1.1 and 16.11.1.1.1, is prohibited.

"16.11.2.4 Sponsors. An individual (e.g., tennis player or golfer) who is not representing an educational institution during participation in athletics competition may not accept any expenses, or any other form of compensation, to participate in the competition from any sponsor other than an individual upon whom the athlete is naturally or legally dependent or the organization (other than a professional sports organization) that is sponsoring the competition.

"16.11.2.5 Expenses Based on Place Finish. Receipt of expenses is prohibited when the amount received is based on the individual's place finish achieved in the competition (e.g., tennis, golf, track and field).

"16.11.2.6 FCA Encampments. A student-athlete may not accept expenses from any athletically related organization to attend Fellowship of Christian Athletes encampments. Nationally recognized service organizations and church groups (including the Fellowship of Christian Athletes) may underwrite the actual and necessary expenses for such attendance.

"16.11.2.7 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.11.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional

violations, per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

I. Bylaws: Amend 16.12.2, pages 141-142, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.12.2 Nonpermissible

"16.12.2.1 General Rule. The student-athlete shall not receive any extra benefit. The term "extra benefit" refers to any special arrangement by an institutional employee or representative of the institution's athletics interests to provide the student-athlete or his or her relatives or friends with a benefit not expressly authorized by NCAA legislation.

"16.12.2.2 Discounts and Credits. A student-athlete may not receive a special discount, payment arrangement or credit on a purchase (e.g., airline ticket, clothing) or a service (e.g., laundry, dry cleaning) from an institutional employee or a representative of its athletics interests.

"16.12.2.2.1 Free or Reduced-Cost Services. An athletics representative may not provide a student-athlete with professional services (for which a fee normally would be charged) without charge or at a reduced cost except as permitted elsewhere in this bylaw. Professional services provided at less than the normal rate or at no expense to a student-athlete are considered an extra benefit unless they are available on the same basis to the general student body.

"16.12.2.2.2 Telephones and Credit Cards. It is not permissible to allow a student-athlete to use a telephone or credit card for personal reasons without charge or at a reduced cost.

"16.12.2.2.3 Entertainment Services. A student-athlete may not receive services (e.g., movie tickets, dinners, use of car) from commercial agencies (e.g., movie theaters, restaurants, car dealers) without charge or at reduced rates, or free or reduced-cost admission to professional athletics contests from professional sports organizations, unless such services also are available to the student body in general.

"16.12.2.3 Other Prohibited Benefits. An institutional employee or representative of the institution's athletics interests may not provide a student-athlete with extra benefits or services, including, but not limited to:

"(a) A loan of money;

"(b) A guarantee of bond;

"(c) The use of an automobile; or

"(d) Signing or cosigning a note with an outside agency to arrange a loan.

"16.12.2.4 Preferential Treatment. A student-athlete may not receive preferential treatment, benefits or services for his or

her athletics reputation or skill or pay-back potential as a future professional athlete (see 16.12.1.4 for disabling-injury insurance exception).

16.12.2.5 Camp Concession. It is not permissible for a member institution or a member of its athletics department staff conducting a sports camp to permit a student-athlete (enrolled in the institution) to operate, at the student-athlete's own expense, a concession selling items related to or associated with the camp to campers or others in attendance (see also 13.13.1.5.4.2).

16.12.2.6 Athletics Equipment. A student-athlete may not accept athletics equipment, supplies or clothing (e.g., tennis racquets, golf clubs, hockey sticks, balls, shirts) from a manufacturer or commercial enterprise. Such items may be provided to the student-athlete's institution, to be utilized by the institution's team in accordance with accepted practices for issuance and retrieval of athletics equipment.

16.12.2.7 Sponsor Families. A member institution shall not permit individuals outside the institution to serve as "sponsors" or "families" for student-athletes who are enrolled in the institution unless such a sponsorship program exists to provide the same benefits and support services to all students at the institution.

16.12.2.8 Civic-Group Gifts. A member institution shall not permit a civic group to provide a student-athlete a trip to a postseason football game or to pay summer-camp expenses for a student-athlete.

16.12.2.9 Assistance in Payment of Bills. A member institution is not permitted to administer a fund for a student-athlete (even if funds are provided by the student-athlete) in order to assist the student-athlete in making payments for various personal expenses (e.g., utility bills, rent, fees and entertainment expenses) unless the institution provides such a service to all students and formal accounting procedures are utilized.

16.12.2.10 Eligibility Ramifications—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 16.12.2 in which the value of the benefit is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the student-athlete shall not be affected conditioned upon the student-athlete repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The student-athlete, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the student-athlete repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations, per 2.8.1, and documentation of the student-athlete's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee believes that the lists of permissible activities is exhaustive. If an activity is not listed on the permissible list, it is not permissible. In the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of these lists of nonpermissible activities.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 72 (Dereg. 14) COMPLIMENTARY ADMISSIONS AND TICKET BENEFITS—PERMISSIBLE PROCEDURES

Intent: To amend legislation that permits institutions to provide complimentary tickets only to persons designated by the student-athlete.

Bylaws: Amend 16.2.1, pages 129, as follows:

[Division III]

16.2.1.1 Institutional Contests in the Student-Athlete's Sport. An institution may provide four complimentary admissions per home or away contest to a student-athlete in the sport in which the individual participates (either practices or competes), regardless of whether the student-athlete competes in the contest. **Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated by the student-athlete.**

[16.2.1.1.2 and 16.2.1.1.3 unchanged.]

16.2.1.4 Division III Regulations. Complimentary tickets shall be distributed only to persons designated by the student-athlete. The institution shall be responsible for this administrative procedure, and the student-athlete's eligibility shall be affected by involvement in action contrary to the provisions of 16.2.1.1 and 16.2.2.1."

[16.2.1.5 renumbered as 16.2.1.4, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation and in an attempt to make the Division III Manual more user-friendly, the committee recommends this change to NCAA Bylaw 16.2.1.1. The committee believes that such a change will further clarify permissible procedures with regards to complimentary tickets.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 73 (Dereg. 15) BENEFITS FOR STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To permit Division III institutions to provide benefits to student-athletes only if such benefits are available to students in general.

Legislative Proposals

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.3, page 130, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.3 ACADEMIC AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES. An institution may finance academic and other support services for student-athletes provided such services are provided or are available to students in general.

"16.3.2 Permissible. Academic and other support services that may be financed by an institution are:

- "(a) Tutoring expenses;**
- "(b) Drug-rehabilitation program expenses;**
- "(c) Counseling expenses related to the treatment of eating disorders;**
- "(d) On-campus student development and career counseling (including the provision of related materials of little or no commercial value to student-athletes) utilizing outside resources;**
- "(e) Future professional athletics career counseling from a panel of at least three persons appointed by the institution's chief executive officer (or his or her designated representative from outside the athletics department). Not more than one such panel member may be an athletics department staff member, and all other panel members must be selected by the institution from among its full-time employees who are employed outside the athletics department. All panel members shall be identified to the national office (see 12.3.4);**
- "(f) Actual and necessary expenses to attend proceedings conducted by the institution, its athletics conference or the NCAA that relate to the student-athlete's eligibility to participate in intercollegiate athletics or legal proceedings that result from the student-athlete's involvement in athletics practice or competitive events. The cost of legal representation in such proceedings also may be provided by the institution (or a representative of its athletics interests);**
- "(g) Use of computers and typewriters; and**
- "(h) Cost of a field trip, provided the field trip is required of all students in the course and the fee for such trips is specified in the institution's catalog."**

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.5, pages 131-132, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.5 HOUSING AND MEALS. An institution may finance housing and meal benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics provided such housing and benefits are available to students in general.

"16.5.1 Permissible. Exceptions. Identified housing and meal benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are:

- "(a) Summer Dormitory Rentals. An institution may rent, at the regular institutional rate, dormitory space to a**

prospective or enrolled student-athlete during the summer months if it is the institution's policy to make dormitory space available on the same basis to all prospective or enrolled students (see 15.2.2.4 for permissible housing benefits for student-athletes eligible to receive financial aid while attending summer school);

- "(b) Preseason Practice Expenses. The institution may provide the cost of room and board to student-athletes who report for preseason practice prior to the start of the academic year, it being understood that the student-athlete has been accepted for admission to the institution at the time such benefits are received; and**

- "(d) Meals Incidental to Participation. Student-athletes who are not receiving athletically related financial aid (e.g., walk-ons) may receive the benefit of a training-table meal during the permissible playing and practice season in those instances in which the student-athlete's schedule is affected by involvement in practice activities, provided the student-athlete previously has paid for the same meal (e.g., dinner) at an institutional dining facility; further, all student-athletes are permitted to receive a pre- or postgame meal or snack as a benefit incidental to participation; and"**

[16.5.1-(e) relettered as 16.5.1-(b), unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The Division III philosophy states that student-athletes should not be treated differently than students in general. Consistent with this philosophy, the committee believes that these changes will clarify legislation that permits institutions to provide academic support services and housing and meal benefits to student-athletes as provided to students in general.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 74 (Dereg. 16) MEDICAL EXPENSES

Intent: To amend legislation that permits institutions to provide medical expense benefits incidental to a student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics.

Bylaws: Amend 16.4, pages 130-131, as follows:

[Division III only]

"16.4 MEDICAL EXPENSES. An institution may finance medical expense benefits incidental to a student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics.

"16.4.1 Permissible. Identified medical expense benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are:

- "(a) Athletics medical insurance;**

- "(b) Death and dismemberment insurance for travel connected with intercollegiate athletics competition and practice;
- "(c) Drug-rehabilitation expenses;
- "(d) Counseling expenses related to the treatment of eating disorders;
- "(e) Special individual expenses resulting from a permanent disability that precludes further athletics participation. The illness or injury producing the disability must involve a former student-athlete or have occurred while the student-athlete was enrolled at the institution, or while the prospective student-athlete was on an official paid visit to the institution's campus. An institution or outside agency, or both, may raise money through donations, benefits or like activities to assist the student-athlete or a prospective student-athlete. All funds secured shall be controlled by the institution, and the money shall be used exclusively to meet these expenses;
- "(f) Glasses, contact lenses or protective eyewear (e.g., goggles) for student-athletes who require visual correction in order to participate in intercollegiate athletics;
- "(g) Medical examinations at any time for enrolled student-athletes;
- "(h) Expenses for medical treatment (including transportation and other related costs) incurred by a student-athlete as a result of an athletically related injury. Such expenses may include the cost of traveling to the location of medical treatment or the provision of actual and necessary living expenses for the student-athlete to be treated at a site on or off the campus during the summer months while the student-athlete is not actually attending classes. Medical documentation shall be available to support the necessity of the treatment at the location in question;
- "(j) Surgical expenses to a student-athlete (including a partial qualifier or a nonqualifier) who is injured during the academic year while participating in voluntary physical activities that will prepare the student-athlete for competition;
- "(l) Medication and physical therapy utilized by a student-athlete during the academic year to enable the individual to participate in intercollegiate athletics, regardless of whether the injury or illness is the result of intercollegiate competition or practice;
- "(m) Medication and physical therapy utilized by a student-athlete (even if the student-athlete is not a full-time student) during the academic year to enable the individual to participate in intercollegiate athletics, only if the student-athlete resides on campus (or in the local community of the institution) and appropriate medical docu-

mentation is available to establish that the student-athlete is unable to attend the institution as a full-time student as a result of the student-athlete's injury or illness; and

- "(n) Preseason dental examinations conducted in conjunction with a regular preseason physical examination."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee recommends this revision to NCAA Bylaw 16.4 to indicate that Division III institutions may provide medical expense benefits incidental to a student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics. In the spirit of deregulation, the committee also recommends the deletion of the list of permissible expenses in 16.4-(a) through 16.4-(l) inasmuch as any medical expense incidental to a student-athlete's participation in intercollegiate athletics may be financed by the institution.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 75 (Dereg. 17) AWARDS AND BENEFITS

Intent: To delete specific legislation relating to awards and benefits.

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.6.1.1, page 132, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.6.1.1 Expenses for Spouse/Children to Postseason Football Game. The institution may provide the cost of actual and necessary expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging, meals and expenses associated with team entertainment functions) for the spouse and children of an eligible student-athlete to accompany the student-athlete to a certified postseason football game or an NCAA championship in the sport of football."

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.10.1, page 138, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.10.1.1 Awards or Recognition Meetings. An institution or representatives of its athletics interests (through the institution) may provide actual and necessary expenses to transport a team to awards or recognition meetings specified in 16.1.6, 16.1.7.3 and 16.1.7.4.

"16.10.1.2 Goodwill Tours. The institution may pay the actual and necessary expenses for a student-athlete to participate in a preseason goodwill tour to promote its intercollegiate athletics program, provided the tour does not involve more than two student-athletes in the same sport who have eligibility remaining and is confined to the state in which the institution is located, or within 100 miles of the institution's main campus, if out of state."

[16.10.1.3 through 16.10.1.11 renumbered at 16.10.1.1 through 16.10.1.9, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In a spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of these bylaws. The committee believes that current legislation is not appropriate due to the inherent budgetary restrictions of Division III athletics departments.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 76 (Dereg. 18) EXPENSES FOR COMPETITION

Intent: To amend permissible actual and necessary expenses and departure/return regulations by reformatting the legislation.

A. Bylaws: Amend 16.7.1, page 133, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.7.1 Away-From-Home Contests. The institution may pay the actual costs (but may not provide cash) for reasonable entertainment that takes place within a 100-mile radius of where a team plays or practices in connection with an away-from-home contest or en route to or from such a contest. **It is not permissible for a team to depart more than 48 hours prior to or to remain more than 36 hours after an event or to transport the team to another area for entertainment purposes.**

[16.7.1.1 unchanged.]

"16.7.2 Departure/Return Restrictions. *It is not permissible for a team to depart more than 48 hours prior to or to remain more than 36 hours after an event or to transport the team to another area for entertainment purposes.*

"16.7.2.1 Exceptions. *The time limitations related to the provisions of travel expenses do not apply in the following circumstances:*

- "(a) *Travel prior to and following contests in Hawaii or Alaska;*
- "(b) *Travel prior to and following contests in the 48 contiguous states for member institutions located in Hawaii and Alaska;*
- "(c) *Travel prior to and following regular-season competition that takes place during the institution's official vacation period during the academic year;*
- "(d) *Travel prior to contests in NCAA championship events, NGB championship events in an emerging sport or certified postseason football games; or*
- "(e) *Travel prior to the National Football Foundation Hall of Fame benefit game or the American Football Coaches Retirement Trust benefit game."*

[16.7.3 and 16.7.4 renumbered as 16.7.2 and 16.7.3, unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.2, page 134, as follows:

A-90

Legislative Proposals

[Division III]

"16.8.1.2 Competition While Representing Institution. An institution may provide actual and necessary travel expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging and meals) to a student-athlete for participation in athletics competition, provided the student-athlete competes in the uniform of the institution and, who is eligible for collegiate the competition, provided the student-athlete departs for the competition no earlier than 48 hours prior to the start of the actual competition and remains no more than 36 hours following the conclusion of the actual competition even if the student-athlete does not return with the team. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1, however, they shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility. *Such competition includes:*

"(a) *Regularly scheduled intercollegiate athletics events;*

"(b) *NCAA championship events and NGB championship events in an emerging sport;*

"(c) *A certified postseason football game (see 18.7 and 30.9 for conditions required for certification);*

"(d) *Noncollegiate open, amateur competition; and*

"(e) *Other institutional competition permissible under NCAA legislation, including postseason events.*

"16.8.1.2.1 Departure/Return Expense Restrictions. *An eligible student-athlete may receive actual and necessary travel expenses to represent the institution in athletics competition, provided the student-athlete departs for the competition no earlier than 48 hours prior to the start of the actual competition and remains no more than 36 hours following the conclusion of the actual competition even if the student-athlete does not return with the team."*

[16.8.1.2.1.1 renumbered as 16.8.1.2.1, unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee believes that current legislation is not appropriate due to the inherent budgetary restrictions of Division III athletics departments. In a spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of these bylaws.

Action: Withdrawn.

NO. 77 (Dereg. 19) EXPENSES FOR PRACTICE AND COMPETITION — DURING VACATION PERIOD

Intent: To amend legislation relating to permissible team transportation that may be provided by an institution to a student-athlete that occurs during a vacation period.

Legislative Proposals

A-91

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.5, pages 135-136, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.8.1.5 Travel to NCAA Championships, NGB Championships in Emerging Sports and Postseason Bowl Games during Vacation Period. The institution may provide team transportation for a student-athlete to travel from campus to the site of an NCAA championship or NGB championship in an emerging sport.

"16.8.1.5.1 General Rule. The institution may provide team transportation for a student-athlete to travel from campus to the site of an NCAA championship, NGB championship in an emerging sport or a postseason bowl game and back to campus.

"16.8.1.5.1.1 Exceptions

"(a) Student-Athlete Does Not Use Team Transportation. If the student-athlete goes home during the vacation period, the institution may provide (in lieu of team transportation) the greater of the transportation costs for the student-athlete to travel from:

"(1) Campus to the event site and back to campus;

"(2) Campus to the student-athlete's home and back to campus; or

"(3) The student-athlete's home to the event site and back home.

"(b) Student-Athlete Uses "Leg" of Team Transportation. An institution that provides one "leg" of actual team transportation (i.e., campus to the event site or from the event site back to campus) must deduct the value of the actual transportation cost of that "leg" from the allowance provided the student-athlete in (a) above.

"(c) Second Trip Home. If a student-athlete either uses team transportation to travel from campus to the event site and back to campus, or participates in an event that takes place in the institution's home community, and also has personally paid for a round-trip ticket home during that same vacation period, that student-athlete may be provided actual transportation expenses to travel between campus and home on a second occasion during that same period."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: In the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends these changes to NCAA Bylaw 16.8.1.5 to clarify permissible team transportation that an institution may provide for student-

athletes in traveling to an NCAA championship or NGB championship in an emerging sport during the vacation period. In addition, the committee feels that the exceptions set forth in 16.8.5.1.1 are not appropriate in Division III.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 78 (DEREG. 20) MISSED CLASS TIME FOR PRACTICE — GOLF

Intent: To delete legislation that permits student-athletes in the sport of golf to miss class time for practice activities.

Bylaws: Amend 17.1.8, page 149, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.1.8 Missed Class Time— Division III Practice. No class time shall be missed for practice activities except when a team is traveling to an away-from-home contest and the practice is in conjunction with the contest.

"17.1.8.1 Missed Class Time for Practice Activities—Football and Basketball and Both Segments in All Other Sports except Golf. In the sports of football and basketball and during the traditional and nontraditional segments in all other sports except golf, no class time shall be missed for practice activities except when a team is traveling to an away-from-home contest and the practice is in conjunction with the contest."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Current legislation permits student-athletes in the sport of golf to miss class time for practice activities. The committee believes that all sports should be treated consistently and, in accordance with the Division III philosophy, intercollegiate athletics should only support the institution's educational mission. Accordingly, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this exception for student-athletes to miss class time for practice in the sport of golf.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 79 (Dereg. 21) OUT OF SEASON, NONCOLLEGIATE, AMATEUR COMPETITION — FOOTBALL

Intent: To delete legislation that permits one student-athlete from a member institution's football team to practice or compete as a member of an outside amateur football team outside of the playing season.

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.8.1.1, page 179, as follows:

Legislative Proposals

[Division III]

"17.10.8.1.1 Out-of-Season, Noncollegiate, Amateur Competition. It is permissible for only one student-athlete from a member institution's football team to practice or compete as a member of an outside amateur football team outside the playing season (except as provided in 17.10.8.1.2), provided no member of the athletics department from the institution in which such a student-athlete is enrolled is involved with the team in any way (e.g., coach, official, player)."

Source: NCAA Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The committee believes that Bylaw 17.10.8.1, which states that a student-athlete is ineligible for intercollegiate competition in football if the following enrollment in college and during any year in which the student-athlete is a member of an intercollegiate football squad or team, the student-athlete competes or has competed as a member of any outside football team in any noncollegiate amateur competition, prohibits this exception. Thus, in the spirit of deregulation, the committee recommends the deletion of this bylaw.

Action: Adopted.

AWARDS AND BENEFITS

NO. 80 (NO. 2-47) PERMISSIBLE EXPENSES — MEALS

Intent: To permit an institution to provide meal expenses to a student-athlete who serves on a university committee when he or she misses a regular meal as a result of a committee meeting conducted when regular institutional dining facilities are open.

Bylaws: Amend 16.5.1, pages 131-132, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.5.1 Permissible. Identified housing and meal benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are:
[16.5.1-(a) through 16.5.1-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) **Meals Related to Institutional Committee Service.** A student-athlete who serves on an institutional committee may receive expenses to cover the cost of a meal missed as a result of a committee meeting that occurs when regular institutional dining facilities are open."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Coun-

cil (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This student-athlete welfare proposal will permit all student-athletes who serve on institutional committees (i.e., Student-Athlete Advisory Committee) to receive expenses to cover the cost of missed meals that occur during a committee meeting when regular institutional dining facilities are open, provided such expenses are available to students in general.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 81 (NO. 2-48) HOUSING AND MEALS — VACATION PERIOD EXPENSES

Intent: To specify that an institution may provide room and board expenses for a specific period of time to student-athletes who return to the institution's campus during a vacation period following institutional competition.

Bylaws: Amend 16.5.1, pages 131-132, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.5.1 Permissible. Identified housing and meal benefits incidental to a student's participation in intercollegiate athletics that may be financed by the institution are:

[16.5.1-(a) through 16.5.1-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) **Vacation-Period Expenses.** The institution may provide the cost of room and board to student-athletes (during the institution's official institutional vacation periods during the regular academic year) when in the following circumstances:

"(1) **Student-athletes who** are required to remain on the institution's campus for organized practice sessions or competition during the institution's official vacation period during the regular academic year. If the student-athlete lives at home during the vacation period, the cost of room and board may not be provided by the institution, other than to permit the student-athlete to participate in team meals incidental to practice sessions. If an institution does not provide a meal to its student-athletes, a cash allowance may be provided, not to exceed the amount provided by the institution to institutional staff members on away from campus trips.

"(2) **Student-athletes who return to campus during** the institution's official vacation period occurring during a regular academic term (e.g., not including vacation periods between terms) from competition as outlined in 16.8.1.2-(a) through 16.8.1.2-(e). Under such circumstances, room and board expenses may be provided beginning with the student-athlete's arrival on campus until the

institution's regular dormitories and dining facilities reopen. If the student-athlete lives at home during the vacation period, the cost of room and board may not be provided by the institution.

- "(3) Student-athletes who return to campus during the institution's official vacation period between regular academic terms (e.g., summer-vacation period) from competition as outlined in 16.8.1.2-(a) through 16.8.1.2-(e). Under such circumstances, room and board expenses may be provided for no more than a 48-hour period, beginning with the student-athlete's return to campus. If the student-athlete lives at home during the vacation period, the cost of room and board may not be provided by the institution."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: It is a common occurrence for an institution's team to return to campus from season-ending competition (e.g., last regular-season contest, conference tournament, postseason tournament) during an institutional vacation period. Under the current legislation, it is not permissible for the institution to provide any expenses to student-athletes once they arrive back on campus, even if dormitories and dining facilities are closed. Although the current legislation does allow institutions to provide travel expenses to student-athletes for a period of time up to 36 hours following the end of the competition, this does not include room and board expenses once student-athletes have returned to the institution's campus. This proposal would provide institutions with the discretion of providing room and board for a reasonable period of time in these situations.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 82 (NO. 2-49) PRACTICE EXPENSES — WOMEN'S ROWING — WEATHER EXCEPTION

Intent: To permit intercollegiate teams in the sport of rowing to travel up to 200 miles, outside the institution's state, to engage in practice activities that occur during an institution's academic term when necessitated by weather conditions.

Bylaws: Amend 16.8.1.1.3, page 134, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.8.1.1.3 Women's Rowing—Weather Exception. In the sport of women's rowing, a member institution may transport a team to a practice site beyond the mileage limitations of 16.8.1.1 if necessitated by weather conditions. **If Such practice activities are conducted during an institution's academic term, the**

practice activities shall occur only during an institution's official vacation period and at a site located within the member institution's state or, if outside the state, no more than 200 miles from the institution's campus. All practice activities must be within the institution's declared playing and practice season in the sport of women's rowing."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The sport of rowing is similar to skiing, inasmuch as both sports have a facility requirement dependent on access to natural as opposed to man-made venues. Due to weather conditions, institutions geographically located further North often are prevented from practicing in the spring because the lakes or rivers are frozen. The increase in the distance outside the institution's state for which expenses can be provided for practice activities while classes are in session will provide greater flexibility to accommodate necessary practice needs. It should be noted that the current legislation that prohibits student-athletes from missing class time for practice activities would remain applicable.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 83 (NO. 2-50) PERMISSIBLE BENEFITS — REASONABLE REFRESHMENTS

Intent: To permit an institution to provide its student-athletes with reasonable refreshments for student-athlete educational and business meetings and, on an occasional basis, for celebratory events.

Bylaws: Amend 16.12.1 by adding new 16.12.1.10, page 141, as follows:

[Division III]

[16.12.1.1 through 16.12.1.9 unchanged.]

"16.12.1.10 Reasonable Refreshments. An institution may provide student-athletes with reasonable refreshments (e.g., soft drinks, snacks) for student-athlete educational and business meetings and, on an occasional basis, for celebratory events (e.g., birthdays)."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal would allow institutions to provide reasonable refreshments at student-athlete educational and business meetings and on an occasional basis for celebratory events (e.g., birthdays) without having to charge the student-athletes a fee, provided such a benefit is available to students in general. His-

torically, incidental expense requests have been granted without exception for these types of events.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

NO. 84 (NO. 2-55) ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS — ALUMNI CONTESTS — DIVISION III BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division III institutions to exempt an alumni contest in the sport of basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.5.2.4, pages 162-163, as follows:
[Division III]

"17.5.5.2.4 Division III. The following basketball contests each year may be exempted from a Division III institution's maximum number of contests:

[17.5.5.2.4-(a) through 17.5.5.2.4-(e) unchanged.]

"(f) Alumni Contest. One basketball contest each year with an alumni team of the institution."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Current Division III legislation does not permit institutions to exempt alumni contests in the sport of basketball. In an effort to provide student-athletes in the sport of basketball opportunities similar to those of other sports, basketball alumni contests should be permitted to be exempted from the maximum number of basketball contests, at the institution's discretion.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 85 (NO. 2-56) ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS — ALUMNI MEET — INDOOR AND OUTDOOR TRACK AND FIELD

Intent: To permit Division III institutions to exempt one date of competition in indoor and outdoor track and field each year with an alumni team of the institution.

Bylaws: Amend 17.25.5.2, page 221, as follows:
[Division III]

"17.25.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sports of indoor and outdoor track and field shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-28):

[17.25.5.2-(a) through 17.25.2-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) Alumni Meet. One date of competition in indoor and outdoor track and field each year with an alumni team of the institution."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Current Division III legislation does not permit institutions to exempt alumni contests in the sport of track and field. In an effort to provide student-athletes in the sport of track and field opportunities similar to those of other sports, track and field alumni dates of competition should be permitted to be exempted from the maximum number of track and field dates of competition, at the institution's discretion.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 86 (NO. 2-57) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — CONTEST EXEMPTIONS

Intent: To exempt, on an annual basis, the National Wrestling Coaches Association meet from the maximum contest limitations in the sport of wrestling.

Bylaws: Amend 17.28.5.2, page 231, as follows:
[Division III]

"17.28.5.2 Annual Exemptions. The maximum number of dates of competition in the sport of wrestling shall exclude the following (see Figure 17-31):

[17.28.5.2-(a) through 17.28.5.2-(h) unchanged.]

"(i) NWCA Meet. One date of competition each year in the National Wrestling Coaches Association (NWCA) meet."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: The National Wrestling Coaches Association (NWCA) meet is an annual one-day event held during the wrestling season. It is an invitational meet that features the top two ranked wrestlers at each weight classification. Because of the limited number of student-athletes participating from each institution, participation in the meet often counts as an individual and institutional date of competition. Thus, it may be necessary for some institutions to deny student-athletes the opportunity to participate in the event to avoid counting participation in the institution's maximum contest limitations. This proposal will provide individual student-athletes the opportunity to participate in such an event without affecting institutional commitments. It

should be noted that similar exemptions such as the East-West golf match are applicable in other individual sports.

Action: Adopted.

GENERAL

NO. 87 (NO. 2-44) INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION — SUMMERS

Intent: To specify that the Management Council or an institution may certify international competition held during an institution's summer-vacation period that shall not affect the student-athlete's seasons of eligibility.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.4.6, page 103, as follows:

[Division III]

"14.2.4.6 International Competition/Summers. Competition by a student-athlete representing an institution in international competition during the summer-vacation period shall not affect the student-athlete's seasons of eligibility, provided the competition has been **certified by the institution per Bylaw 30.7.1** or sanctioned by the Management Council, by a two-thirds majority of its members present and voting, and the request for Management Council sanction has been made by the institution at least 30 days prior to the competition."

Source: All members of the State University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: When an institution schedules international competition during the summer-vacation period and the competition has been certified by the institution per Bylaw 30.7.1, the student-athlete who has eligibility remaining should not be charged with a season of competition if the athlete has not participated during the regular season or in the nontraditional season but does participate in international competition.

Committee Position (Division III Administrative Review Subcommittee): The Division III Administrative Review Subcommittee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted as amended.

NO. 88 (NO. 2-61) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS — MINIMUM PARTICIPANTS — DIVISION III WOMEN'S FENCING

Intent: To specify that in the sport of women's fencing, an institu-

A-100

Legislative Proposals

tion's team shall include a minimum of five participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contest requirements.

Bylaws: Amend 20.11.3.2, pages 261-262, as follows:

[Division III]

"20.11.3.2 Minimum Contests and Participants Requirements for Sports Sponsorship. In each sport, the institution's team shall engage in at least a minimum number of intercollegiate contests (against four-year, degree-granting collegiate institutions) each year. In the individual sports, the institution's team shall include a minimum number of participants in each contest that is counted toward meeting the minimum-contests requirement. The following minimums are applicable:

Team Sports	Minimum Contests	Individual Sports	Minimum Contests	Minimum Participants
		Women's Fencing	6	3 5"

[Remainder of 20.11.3.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The proposed increase in the minimum-participants requirements for women's fencing is necessary in order to reflect the addition of women's epee in 1995. Because an institution is unable to win an intercollegiate fencing contest with less than five student-athletes, the proposed recommendation to increase the minimum from three to five is appropriate.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 89 (NO. 2-62) NCAA CHAMPIONSHIPS — BENCH PERSONNEL — LOGO RESTRICTIONS

Intent: To specify that the logo restrictions on student-athletes' apparel set forth in Bylaw 12.5.5 apply during NCAA championships to all personnel (e.g., coaches, trainers, managers) who are in the team bench area for practices and games, and who participate in NCAA news conferences.

Bylaws: Amend 31.1 by adding new 31.1.3, page 294, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III]

[31.1.2 unchanged.]

"31.1.3 Logo Restrictions—Bench Personnel. The logo restrictions on student-athletes' apparel set forth in 12.5.5 shall apply during NCAA championships to all personnel (e.g., coaches, trainers, managers) who are in the team bench area for practices and games, and who participate in NCAA news conferences."

Legislative Proposals

A-101

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: August 1, 2000; those contracts between institutions and apparel manufacturers or distributors that include logo specifications may be honored, provided such contracts were in effect prior to September 23, 1999.

Rationale: Currently, one of the Association's basic principles of amateurism is to protect student-athletes from exploitation by commercial enterprises. To further that principle, the Association has placed appropriate restrictions on the size of logos that may appear on apparel worn by student-athletes participating in competition. However, there currently are no logo restrictions on apparel worn by the coach or other bench personnel, and concern has been expressed that the potential for commercial exploitation, particularly at the site of NCAA championships could result. This proposal will ensure that student-athletes, coaches and other bench personnel are promoting their institutions (as opposed to any commercial entity) by placing identical restrictions during an NCAA championship on bench personnel that currently exist for student-athletes participating in the championship.

Action: Defeated.

CONSENT PACKAGE

NO. 90 (NO. 2-41) DE MINIMIS VIOLATIONS — TRANSPORTATION ON UNOFFICIAL VISITS

Intent: To specify that a prospective student-athlete on an unofficial visit may not receive transportation other than transportation to view off-campus practice and competition sites in the prospect's sport and other institutional facilities within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus; further, to specify that a violation of this legislation is de minimis in nature and will not render an enrolled student-athlete ineligible, while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

Bylaws: Amend 13.6.3, page 79, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.6.3 Transportation on Unofficial Visit. During any unofficial recruiting visit, the institution may provide the prospect with transportation only to view off-campus practice and competition sites in the prospect's sport and other institutional facilities (located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus). An institutional staff member must accompany the prospect during

such a trip. Payment of any other transportation expenses, including providing transportation to attend one of the institution's home contests (on or off campus), *shall cause the trip to become an official paid visit is not permissible. For violations of 13.6.3 in which the value of the transportation is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1 and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report of the violation.*"

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This amendment will help to clarify this bylaw and eliminate confusion. As the legislation is currently written, an institution avoids the violation by considering the visit an official visit. This proposal will recognize that a violation did in fact occur and, if the value of the transportation is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual will not be affected, conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 91 (NO. 2-42) DE MINIMIS VIOLATION — REQUIREMENT FOR PRACTICE

Intent: To specify that if a student-athlete practices while enrolled in less than a full-time program of studies, such a violation is considered de minimis and will not render a student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation is still considered an institutional violation.

Bylaws: Amend 14.1.6.1, pages 98-99, as follows:
[Division III]

"14.1.6.1 Requirement for Practice. To be eligible to participate in organized practice sessions, a student-athlete shall be enrolled in a minimum full-time program of studies leading to a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as defined by the regulations of the certifying institution. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, the violation shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility.**"
[Remainder of 14.1.6.1 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal, similar to those adopted at the past four Conventions, is an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare the student-athlete ineligible as a result of a violation where the student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurred. Currently, a violation of this proposal results in an immediate reinstatement of eligibility without conditions imposed on the student-athlete. The institution still will be held accountable for any institutional responsibility regarding a violation of this regulation.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

**NO. 92 (NO. 2-45) SEASON OF COMPETITION WAIVER —
60-DAY DEADLINE**

Intent: To delete the requirement that to be granted a season of competition waiver, an institution must submit its waiver request not later than 60 days from the date on which the institution first has knowledge that the student-athlete competed while ineligible.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.6.1.2, pages 104-105, as follows:
[Division III]

"14.2.6.1.2 Application Deadline. The institution shall submit its request for a waiver not later than 60 days from the date on which the institution first has knowledge that the student-athlete competed while ineligible."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: The current legislation unfairly punishes a student-athlete for an administrative error or delay on the part of the member institution.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

**NO. 93 (NO. 2-51) PERMISSIBLE BENEFITS — NCAA
RESEARCH STUDIES**

Intent: To permit a student-athlete to receive compensation for participation in specified NCAA research studies.

Bylaws: Amend 16.12.1 by adding new 16.12.1.10, page 141, as follows:

[Division III]

[16.12.1.1 through 16.12.1.9 unchanged.]

"16.12.1.10 NCAA Research Studies. A student-athlete may receive compensation from the Association for participat-

ing in specified NCAA research studies. Such compensation shall be consistent with the going rate for compensation offered in studies involving nonathlete populations."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Many projects conducted by the NCAA Research Committee on behalf of the Association address issues specific to student-athletes. It is common practice for researchers to offer compensation to study participants. This practice provides incentive for subject recruitment, participation and completeness; without such incentive, much research, regardless of the topic, would be difficult to conduct. A foundation of any research is to attempt to study the specific population of interests whenever possible. The current inability to compensate student-athletes has had a negative impact on research studies associated with student-athlete welfare. It is also recognized that there are many student-athlete welfare issues that may benefit significantly from such research. The NCAA Research Committee and the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports both have recommended that compensation, consistent with that offered in studies in nonathlete populations, be allowed for student-athletes participating in NCAA-funded research.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

NO. 94 (NO. 2-52) INCIDENTAL-EXPENSE WAIVERS

Intent: To specify that an institution may provide a student-athlete a specific expense that has been previously approved by the NCAA Division III Management Council, or a committee designated by the Management Council, as incidental to the student-athlete's participation in athletics without submitting a formal waiver request to the national office.

Bylaws: Amend 16.13.1 by adding new 16.13.1.1, page 142, as follows:

[Division III]

"16.13.1.1 Previously Approved Incidental Expenses. Specific incidental expenses that have been previously approved on a routine basis by the Management Council, or a committee designated by the Management Council, may be processed by an institution or conference. Documentation of each approval shall be kept on file at the institution or the conference office."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council [Management Council (Committee on Interpretations and Legislation)].

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Legislative Proposals

Rationale: Currently, there are several types of incidental-expense waivers that the NCAA routinely approves (e.g., flowers to student-athlete's family when there is a death in the family). These types of waivers are placed on the NCAA membership services database as a resource for institutions to research prior to submitting incidental-expense waivers. Institutions and conferences should be given the authority to approve or deny incidental-expense waivers that are based on a list of waivers included on the incidental-expense waiver database. This proposal would reduce time demands associated with processing routine waiver requests.

Action: Adopted, effective immediately.

Appendix B

Roll-Call Voting

Due to circumstances beyond the control of the NCAA national office, a summary of roll-call votes was unavailable from the 2000 Convention.

Appendix C

Past Convention Sites

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)

Convention	Year	City, Hotel
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)
84th	1990	Dallas (Loews Anatole)

<i>Convention</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>City, Hotel</i>
85th	1991	Nashville (Opryland)
86th	1992	Anaheim (Hilton and Towers)
87th	1993	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
88th	1994	San Antonio (Marriott Rivercenter)
89th	1995	San Diego (Marriott Marina)
90th	1996	Dallas (Wyndham Anatole)
91st	1997	Nashville (Opryland)
92nd	1998	Atlanta (Marriott and Hyatt)
93rd	1999	San Antonio (Marriott Rivercenter)

Appendix D

NCAA Officers, 1906-1999

Years *Name, Institution*

President

1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts University
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College of Colorado
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas at Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1989-1990—Albert M.F. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1991-1992—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1993-1995—Joseph N. Crowley, University of Nevada
 1995-1997—Eugene F. Corrigan, Atlantic Coast Conference

Secretary-Treasurer

1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908 —William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)

1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference
(Big Ten)
1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of
District of Columbia
1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton
1989-1990—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
1991-1992—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
1993—Cedric W. Dempsey, University of Arizona
1994—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference
1995-1997—Phyllis L. Howlett, Big Ten Conference

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
1985—Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
1986—Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
1987-1988—Albert M.F. Witte, University of Arkansas,
Fayetteville
1989-1990—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
1991—Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los Angeles
1992-1993—R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton
1994-1995—William M. Sangster, Georgia Institute of Technology
1996-1997—Robert M. Sweazy, Texas Tech University

Division II Vice-President

1983—Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska Fairbanks
1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
1986—Asa N. Green, Livingston University
1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
1989-1990—Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University
1991-1992—Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of
Pennsylvania
1993-1994—Charles N. Lindemann, Humboldt State University
1995-1997—Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University

Division III Vice-President

1983—Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster
1990-1991—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University
1992-1993—John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University
1994-1995—Edward G. Coll Jr., Alfred University
1996-1997—Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La
Crosse

NCAA Officers, 1997-1999

Executive Committee Chair

1997-1998—Samuel H. Smith, Washington State University
1999—Charles Wethington Jr., University of Kentucky

Division I Board of Directors Chair

1997-1998—Kenneth A. Shaw, Syracuse University
1998—Graham Spanier, Pennsylvania State University

Division II Presidents Council Chair

1997-1998—Adam W. Herbert, University of North Florida
1998-1999—Arend D. Lubbers, Grand Valley State University
1999—Gladys Styles Johnston, University of Nebraska at
Kearney

Division III Presidents Council Chair

1997-1998—Curtis L. McCray, Millikin University
1998-1999—Judith L. Kuipers, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse
1999—Ann H. Die, Hendrix College

NATL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOC
1NCAA00006211N



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

NCAA 15049-8/00

CP00